



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

KF17982

NEDL TRANSFER

HN 4TUI Z

No right under the Constitution to hold Subject States.  
To every People belongs the right to establish its own government in its own way.  
The United States can not with honor buy the title of a dispossessed tyrant, or crush a Republic.

---

S P E E C H

OF

HON. GEORGE F. HOAR,  
OF MASSACHUSETTS,

IN THE

SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,

APRIL 17, 1900.

— • —

WASHINGTON.

1900.

F 17982

1

HARVARD  
UNIVERSITY  
LIBRARY

S P E E C H  
O F  
H O N . G E O R G E F . H O A R .

The Senate having under consideration the joint resolution (S. R. 53) defining the policy of the United States relative to the Philippine Islands, as follows:

*Be it resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Philippine Islands are territory belonging to the United States; that it is the intention of the United States to retain them as such and to establish and maintain such governmental control throughout the archipelago as the situation may demand—*

Mr. HOAR said:

Mr. PRESIDENT: When, on the 8th of July, 1898, less than two years ago, the lamented Vice-President declared the session of the Senate at an end, the people of the United States were at the high-water mark of prosperity and glory. No other country on earth, in all history, ever saw the like. It was an American prosperity and an American glory.

We were approaching the end of a great century. From thirteen States we had become forty-five States. From 3,000,000 people we had become near 80,000,000. An enormous foreign commerce, promising to grow to still vaster proportions in the near future, was thrown into insignificance by an internal commerce almost passing the capacity of numbers to calculate. Our manufactures, making their way past hostile tariffs and fiscal regulations, were displacing the products of the greatest manufacturing nations in their own markets. South of us, from the Rio Grande to Cape Horn, our Monroe doctrine had banished from the American continent the powers of Europe; Spain and France had retired; monarchy had taken its leave; and the whole territory was occupied by republics owing their freedom to us, forming their institutions on our example. Our flag, known and honored throughout the earth, was welcomed everywhere in friendly ports, and floated everywhere on friendly seas. We were the freest, richest, strongest nation on the face of the earth—strong in all the elements of material strength, stronger still in the justice and liberty on which the foundations of our empire were laid. We had abolished slavery within our own borders by our constitutional mandate, and had abolished slavery throughout the world by the influence of our example.

Our national debt had been reduced with unexampled rapidity. We had increased it somewhat for the necessary expenses of the war. But if it had all been due, we could have paid it all in a single year by a tax solely upon the luxuries of the rich, which the rich would scarcely have felt, and which would have vexed no manufacture and no branch of commerce. Rich in all material wealth, we were richer still in a noble history and in those priceless ideals by which a Republic must live or bear no life.

From all over the country came the voice of well-paid labor, dwelling in happy homes, full of contentment with the present and of hope for the future. Capital was seeking new investments on all sides. Our domestic market, rescued from foreign invasion, was our own. Foreign markets were opening. The balance of trade was on our side. The product of American industry was carried abroad on an overwhelming and increasing tide.

We had won the glory of a great liberator in both hemispheres. The flag of Spain—emblem of tyranny and cruelty—had been driven from the Western Hemisphere, and was soon to go down from her eastern possessions. The war had been conducted without the loss of a gun or the capture of an American soldier in battle. The glory of this great achievement was unlike any other which history has recorded. It was not that we had beaten Spain. It was not that 75,000,000 people had conquered 15,000,000. Not that the spirit of the nineteenth century had been too much for the spirit of the fifteenth century. Not that the young athlete had felled to the ground a decrepit old man of ninety. It was not that the American mechanic and engineer in the machine shop could make better ships or better guns; or that the American soldier or sailor had displayed the same quality in battle that he had shown on every field—at Bunker Hill, at Yorktown, at Lundys Lane, at New Orleans, at Buena Vista, at Gettysburg; in every sea fight on Lake Erie or on the Atlantic. Nobody doubted the skill of the American general, the gallantry of the American admiral, or the courage of the American soldier or sailor. The glory of the war and of the victory was that it was a war and a victory in the interest of liberty. The American flag had appeared as a liberator in both hemispheres; when it floated over Havana or Santiago or Manila, there was written on its folds, where all nations could read it, the pledge of the resolution of Congress and the declaration of the President.

Every true American thanked God that he had lived to behold that day. The rarest good fortune of all was the good fortune of President McKinley. He was, in my judgment, the best beloved President who ever sat in the chair of Washington. His name was inseparably connected with two periods of unexampled prosperity, made more impressive by the period of calamity which came between them. The people believed that to the great measure called by his name was due a time of happiness and comfort never equaled in this country, and never approached by any other. It was the high-water mark on this planet of everything that could bring happiness to a people. But high as the tide reached then, it went still higher under the operation of the policies which came in with his Administration.

He had won golden honors by his patriotic hesitation in bringing on the war, and by his interpretation of the purpose with which the people at last entered upon it.

When I say that President McKinley was the best beloved President that ever sat in the chair of Washington, I do not mean, of course, to compare the reverence in which any living man is held with that which attends the memory of Washington or Lincoln. But Washington and Lincoln encountered while they were alive a storm of political hostility, which President McKinley has fortunately been spared. I repeat that it seems to me that President McKinley holds a place in the affection of the people at large which no one of his predecessors ever attained in his life-time.

The promise which the President and the Senate made as to Cuba we have, so far, done our best to redeem. When the Spanish fleet was sunk and the Spanish flag went down from over Havana, peace and order and contentment and reviving industry and liberty followed the American flag. Some of us had hoped for the same thing in the East. We had hoped that a like policy would have brought a like result in the Philippine Islands. No man contemplated for a moment the return of those islands to Spain. One of the apostles would as soon have thought of giving back a redeemed soul to the dominion of Satan.

The American people, so far as I know, were all agreed that their victory brought with it the responsibility of protecting the liberated peoples from the cupidity of any other power until they could establish their own independence in freedom and in honor.

I stand here to-day to plead with you not to abandon the principles that have brought these things to pass. I implore you to keep to the policy that has made the country great, that has made the Republican party great, that has made the President great. I have nothing new to say. But I ask you to keep in the old channels, and to keep off the old rocks laid down in the old charts, and to follow the old sailing orders that all the old captains of other days have obeyed, to take your bearings, as of old, from the north star,

Of whose true fixed and resting quality  
There is no fellow in the firmament,

and not from this meteoric light of empire.

Especially, if I could, would I persuade the great Republican party to come back again to its old faith, to its old religion, before it is too late. There is yet time. The President has said again and again that his is only an ad interim policy until Congress shall act. It is not yet too late. Congress has rejected, unwisely, as I think, some declarations for freedom. But the two Houses have not as yet committed themselves to despotism. The old, safe path, the path alike of justice and of freedom, is still easy. It is a path familiar, of old, to the Republican party. If we have diverged from it for the first time, everything in our history, everything in our own nature calls us back. The great preacher of the English church tells you how easy is the return of a great and noble nature from the first departure from rectitude:

"For so a taper, when its crown of flame is newly blown off, retains a nature so symbolical to light, that it will with greediness rekindle and snatch a ray from the neighbor fire."

I, for one, believed, and still believe that the pathway to prosperity and glory for the country was also the pathway to success and glory for the Republican party. I thought the two things inseparable. If, when we made the treaty of peace, we had adhered to the purpose we declared when we declared war; if we had dealt with the Philippine Islands as we promised to deal, have dealt, and expect to deal with Cuba, the country would have escaped the loss of 6,000 brave soldiers, other thousands of wrecked and shattered lives, the sickness of many more, the expenditure of hundreds of millions, and, what is far worse than all, the trampling under foot of its cherished ideals. There would have been to-day a noble republic in the East, sitting docile at our feet, receiving from us civilization, laws, manners, and giving in turn everything the gratitude of a free people could give—love, obedience, trade. The Philippine youth would throng our universities; our Constitution, our Declaration, the lives of Washington and

Lincoln, the sayings of Jefferson and Franklin would have been the text-books of their schools. How our orators and poets would have delighted to contrast America liberating and raising up the republic of Asia, with England subduing and trampling under foot the republic of Africa. Nothing at home could have withstood the great party and the great President who had done these things. We should have come from the next election with a solid North and have carried half the South. You would at least have been spared the spectacle of great Republican States rising in revolt against Republican policies.

I do not expect to accomplish anything for liberty in the Philippine Islands but through the Republican party. Upon it the fate of these islands for years to come is to depend. If that party can not be persuaded, the case is in my judgment for the present hopeless. That party will be in power for the next twelve months. It will be continued in power for at least four years thereafter. If it were otherwise, what we do within the next twelve months could not be undone without the consent of a Republican Senate. Our majority in the Senate for at least four years is assured; and if that were doubtful there are Democrats enough committed to this expansion policy to make it sure if the bulk of the Republican party determine to continue it.

I can not look with any favor upon Mr. Bryan as an alternative. I can not believe that there is anything to hope for from his election. Upon all other questions than imperialism he announces no single doctrine, principle, or purpose which has in it anything either of prosperity or safety to the Republic. And I can not forget that when it was attempted to defeat the Paris treaty, or at least to compel an amendment which, if it had been done, would have put the Philippine Islands upon the same footing with Cuba, would have prevented the war, and would have preserved our national doctrines of liberty and our ancient policy, it was due to Mr. Bryan, more than to any other man after the treaty left the hands of the President, that that attempt was frustrated. Unless he is much misrepresented he used all his power and influence with those of his friends who were ready to listen to his counsel to secure the ratification of the treaty. That ratification involved the continuance of the war, which had then proceeded no further than an unauthorized outbreak of hostilities and an assumption of sovereignty over an unwilling people—to be purchased by the United States—the cause of a year's war and all the disasters and melancholy history of the last twelve months.

I do not underrate the importance of this issue. It is greater than parties, greater than administrations, greater than the happiness or prosperity of a single generation. But in pleading for justice to these dusky millions of distant Asiatics, I can not forget 10,000,000 American citizens here at home, to whom neither citizenship nor manhood is hereafter to be worth having unless the Republican party stand by them. Who can fail to read the signs of the times? The Senator from Alabama, finding himself hard beset, made his bid for the favor of the Democrats of Alabama by proclaiming in his speech made in his place here, but meant for his campaign at home, the unfitness of the negro for self-government, and demanding the repeal of the Constitutional amendments. And Alabama, even if she dislike his imperialism, will take him on those terms. Three States have adopted constitutions contrived with masterly ingenuity to exclude negroes

from the right to vote. Others are getting ready to follow in their footsteps. The Senator from South Carolina, in an utterance whose terrible meaning is almost forgotten in our admiration for the manly frankness of the avowal, said, the other day, in the Senate:

We took the government away. We stuffed ballot boxes. We shot them. We are not ashamed of it. The Senator from Wisconsin would have done the same thing. I see it in his eye right now. He would have done it. With that system—force, tissue ballots, etc.—we got tired ourselves. So we called a constitutional convention, and we eliminated, as I said, all of the colored people whom we could under the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments.

I want to call your attention to the remarkable change that has come over the spirit of the dream of the Republicans; to remind you gentlemen from the North that your slogans of the past—brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God—have gone glimmering down the ages. The brotherhood of man exists no longer, because you shoot negroes in Illinois, when they come in competition with your labor, as we shoot them in South Carolina when they come in competition with us in the matter of elections. You do not love them any better than we do. You used to pretend that you did, but you no longer pretend it except to get their votes.

You deal with the Filipinos just as we deal with the negroes, only you treat them a heap worse.—*Congressional Record*, Fifty-sixth Congress, first session, pages 2347, 2349.

In England an issue can be made up on one question. Men go from party to party in Parliament; if the Government be defeated, the ministry resign, the question is settled, and the new ministry is displaced again when it is beaten on some other important issue.

With us, we have a system of periodicity. The President is put in power for four years, the majority in the House for two years, and the majority in the Senate can never be changed in less than two years, and ordinarily the process takes at least six. So you have to determine not whether the President, or the Senators, or the Representatives be right on a single question; you must choose between the forces arrayed on one side or the other, and determine which you will trust with government on all questions for an indefinite or at least a long future.

Now, I do not wish to speak unkindly of our Democratic antagonists. Toleration comes with age and experience. I am glad to recognize cheerfully the patriotic purpose and the manly qualities of so many of the leaders the Democratic States of the South have contributed of late to the public service.

But I can not forget that the main power in the Democratic party still abides with the combinations of men who govern the cities of New York and of Chicago; with the men who are believers in what seems to me a dishonest currency, and in a policy that would bring distress and poverty into the homes of millions of American workmen; the men who would undermine the Supreme Court, and the men who would destroy the safeguards of property.

I can not see, in Mr. Bryan in the *Presidentia*, chair and the Senate and Congress so controlled, either hope that this policy of imperialism will be abandoned or that any good can come which will compensate us for the great evil such a rule will bring with it. I am not ready to take the administration of this country from the party which for fifty years has been wrong but once, and commit it to the party which for fifty years has never once been right.

Mr. TILLMAN. Not even on the Philippines?

Mr. HOAR. So far.

I believe that, if not to-day or to-morrow, yet at an early day,

better knowledge of the facts, the light of experience, the love of liberty and justice which still burns in the hearts of the Republican masses in this country, will bring that party back to the principles and policy upon which it planted itself in the beginning.

No, Mr. President. If we subjugate the Filipinos we are, if you have your way, to govern 10,000,000 people in the East and nearly another million in the West Indies without any constitutional restraint. There will be under the flag 20,000,000 of other races, black men at home and brown men abroad, for whom it bears no star of hope. I do not see my way clear to hand them over to Mr. Bryan, in the Executive chair, and the Senators from Alabama and South Carolina, in the Senate, or to the party of which, beyond all question, they are to be most powerful and conspicuous leaders.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. TILLMAN. I am informed that the Senator requested in the opening of his speech that he be not interrupted. If he does not wish to be interrupted now, I shall not intrude upon him.

Mr. HOAR. No. I am suffering with the disorder that is now so prevalent, and I very much doubt whether I shall be able to conclude my speech. If I have misrepresented the Senator in any way, I will yield for an interruption, otherwise I shall proceed.

Mr. TILLMAN. Under the circumstances, Mr. President, I shall not interrupt the Senator.

Mr. HOAR. I believe I have said nothing of the Senator except to read his language.

Mr. TILLMAN. The Senator, however, continued to allude to the Senator from South Carolina in a manner that would warrant interruption and controversy, but I will not interrupt the Senator further.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I have alluded to the Senator from South Carolina only to say, in addition to quoting his language, that he was beyond all question hereafter to be one of the most powerful and conspicuous leaders of the Democratic party. I take it the Senator does not deem that an aspersion.

I believe, Mr. President, not only that perseverance in this policy will be the abandonment of the principles upon which our Government is founded, that it will change our Republic into an empire, that our methods of legislation, of diplomacy, of administration must hereafter be those which belong to empires, and not those which belong to republics; but I believe persistence in this attempt will result in the defeat and overthrow of the Republican party. That defeat may not come this year, or next year. I pray God it may never come. I well remember when the old Whig party, in the flush of delirium and anticipated triumph, gave up the great doctrines which it had so often avowed, and undertook to abandon the great territory between the Mississippi and the Pacific to its fate. It held its convention at Philadelphia. It selected as its candidate a great military chieftain. Amid the tempest and delirium a quiet delegate from my own State arose and declared to the convention that the Whig party was dead. It seemed that a more audacious, a more foolish, a more astounding utterance never fell upon human ears. And what was the result? The party carried the country and elected its President. But within less than four years thereafter Daniel Webster, as he

lay dying at Marshfield, said, "The Whig party as a political organization is gone; and it is well." Let no such fate attend the Republican party. In my judgment, if not now, it will retrace its steps in time.

The practical question which divided the American people last year, and which divides them to-day, is this: Whether in protecting the people of the Philippine Islands from the ambition and cupidity of other nations we are bound to protect them from our own.

Edward Everett concludes that masterpiece of consummate oratory, his address on the character of Washington:

Let us make a national festival and holiday of his birthday; and ever as the 22d of February returns let us remember that while with these solemn and joyous rites of observance we celebrate the great anniversary, our fellow-citizens on the Hudson, on the Potomac, from the Southern plains to the Western lakes, are engaged in the same offices of gratitude and love. Nor we, nor they alone. Beyond the Ohio, beyond the Mississippi, along that stupendous trail of immigration from the East to the West, which, bursting into States as it moves westward, is already threading the Western prairies, swarming through the portals of the Rocky Mountains and winding down their slopes, the name and the memory of Washington on that gracious night will travel with the silver queen of heaven through sixty degrees of longitude, nor part company with her till she walks in her brightness through the Golden Gate of California and passes serenely on to hold midnight court with her Australian stars. There and there only, in barbarous archipelagos, as yet untrodden by civilized man, the name of Washington is unknown; and there, too, when they swarm with enlightened millions, new honors shall be paid with ours to his memory.

The time which the orator predicted came. In that Eastern archipelago, no longer the home of barbarism, a people had achieved their independence and thrown off the yoke of centuries. They were longing for civilization, education, and liberty. To the millions, with which that land is swarming, in the dawning of a new light the name of Washington has become familiar. But, alas, the people are citing his example to protect their own liberties against his countrymen. They are nearly threefold in number the people to whom his Farewell Address was delivered. Pray to God that that revered and beautiful character, our shield so often against distempered folly and unhallowed ambition, may be theirs also.

In dealing with this question, Mr. President, I do not mean to enter upon any doubtful ground. I shall advance no proposition ever seriously disputed in this country till within twelve months. I shall cite no authority that is not by the common consent of all parties and all men of all shades of opinion recognized as among the very weightiest in jurisprudence and in the conduct of the State. I shall claim nothing as fact which is not abundantly proven by the evidence of the great commanders who conducted this war; by evidence coming from the President and the heads of department, or persons for whose absolute trustworthiness these authorities vouch.

If to think as I do in regard to the interpretation of the Constitution; in regard to the mandates of the moral law or the law of nations, to which all men and all nations must render obedience; in regard to the policies which are wisest for the conduct of the State, or in regard to those facts of recent history in the light of which we have acted or are to act hereafter, be treason, then Washington was a traitor; then Jefferson was a traitor; then Jackson was a traitor; then Franklin was a traitor; then Sumner was a traitor; then Lincoln was a traitor; then Webster was a traitor; then Clay was a traitor; then Corwin was a traitor; then

Kent was a traitor; then Seward was a traitor; then McKinley, within two years, was a traitor; then the Supreme Court of the United States has been in the past a nest and hotbed of treason; then the people of the United States, for more than a century, have been traitors to their own flag and their own Constitution.

We are presented with an issue that can be clearly and sharply stated as a question of constitutional power, a question of international law, a question of justice and righteousness, or a question of public expediency. This can be stated clearly and sharply in the abstract, and it can be put clearly and sharply by an illustration growing out of existing facts.

The constitutional question is: Has Congress the power, under our Constitution, to hold in subjection unwilling vassal States?

The question of international law is: Can any nation rightfully convey to another sovereignty over an unwilling people who have thrown off its dominion, asserted their independence, established a government of their own, over whom it has at the time no practical control, from whose territory it has been disseized, and which it is beyond its power to deliver?

The question of justice and righteousness is: Have we the right to crush and hold under our feet an unwilling and subject people whom we had treated as allies, whose independence we are bound in good faith to respect, who had established their own free government, and who had trusted us?

The question of public expediency is: Is it for our advantage to promote our trade at the cannon's mouth and at the point of the bayonet?

All these questions can be put in a way of practical illustration by inquiring whether we ought to do what we have done, are doing, and mean to do in the case of Cuba; or what we have done, are doing, and some of you mean to do in the case of the Philippine Islands.

It does not seem to me to be worth while to state again at length the constitutional argument which I have addressed to the Senate heretofore. It has been encountered with eloquence, with clearness and beauty of statement, and, I have no doubt, with absolute sincerity by Senators who have spoken upon the other side. But the issue between them and me can be summed up in a sentence or two, and if, so stated, it can not be made clear to any man's apprehension, I despair of making it clear by any elaboration or amplification.

I admit that the United States may acquire and hold property, and may make rules and regulations for its disposition.

I admit that, like other property, the United States may acquire and hold land. It may acquire it by purchase. It may acquire it by treaty. It may acquire it by conquest. And it may make rules and regulations for its disposition and government, however it be acquired.

When there are inhabitants upon the land so acquired it may make laws for their government. But the question between me and the gentlemen on the other side is this: Is this acquisition of territory, of land or other property, whether gained by purchase, conquest, or treaty, a constitutional end or only a means to a constitutional end? May you acquire, hold, and govern territory or other property as an end for which our Constitution was framed, or is it only a means toward some other and further end? May you acquire, hold, and govern property by conquest, treaty,

or purchase for the sole object of so holding and governing it, without the consideration of any further constitutional purpose? Or must you hold it for a constitutional purpose only, such as the making of new States, the national defense and security, the establishment of a seat of government, or the construction of forts, harbors, and like works, which, of course, are themselves for the national defense and security?

I hold that this acquisition, holding, and governing can be only a means for a constitutional end—the creation of new States or some other of the constitutional purposes to which I have adverted. And I maintain that you can no more hold and govern territory than you can hold and manage cannon or fleets for any other than a constitutional end; and I maintain that the holding in subjection an alien people, governing them against their will for any fancied advantage to them, is not only not an end provided for by the Constitution, but is an end prohibited therein.

Now, with due respect to the gentlemen who have discussed this matter, I do not find that they have answered this proposition or undertaken to answer it. I do not find that they have understood it. You have, in my judgment, under your admitted power to acquire, own, and govern territory, which is just like your admitted power to govern, own, and control ships or guns, no more right under the Constitution to hold that territory for the sake of keeping in subjection an alien people than you have a right to acquire, hold, and manage cannon or fleets or to raise armies for the sake of keeping in subjection and under your control an alien people. All these things are means; and means to constitutional and not to unconstitutional ends.

The Constitution of the United States sets forth certain specific objects and confers certain specific powers upon the Government it creates. All powers necessary or reasonably convenient to accomplishing these specific objects and exercising these specific powers are granted by implication. In my judgment the Constitution should be liberally construed in determining the extent of such powers. In that I agree with Webster and Hamilton and Lincoln and Washington and Marshall, and not with Calhoun or the Democrats of the time of the war of the rebellion and since. But the most liberal statesman or jurist never went further than the rule I have stated in claiming constitutional powers for our Government. The Constitution says that Congress may make rules and regulations for the government of the territory and other property of the United States. That implies that we may acquire and regulate territory as we may acquire and use other property, such as our ships of war, our cannon or forts or arsenals. But territory, like other property, can only be acquired for constitutional purposes, and can not be acquired and governed for unconstitutional purposes. Now, one constitutional purpose is to admit new States to the Union. That is one of the objects for which the Constitution was framed. So we may acquire and hold and govern territory with that object in view. But governing subject peoples, and holding them for that purpose, is not a constitutional end. On the contrary, it is an end which the generation which framed the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence declared was unrighteous and abhorrent. So, in my opinion, we have no constitutional power to acquire territory for the purpose of holding it in subjugation, in a state of vassalage or serfdom, against the will of its people.

It is to be noted just here that we have acquired no territory or other property in the Philippine Islands, save a few public buildings. By every other acquisition of territory the United States became a great land owner. She owned the public lands as she had owned the public lands in the Northwest ceded to her by the old States. But you own nothing in the Philippines. The people own their farms and dwellings and cities. The religious orders own the rest. The Filipinos desire to do what our English ancestors did in the old days when England was Catholic. The laity feared that the Church would engross all the land. So they passed their statute of mortmain. You have either got to let the people of the Philippine Islands settle this matter for themselves, or you must take upon you the delicate duty of settling it for them. Your purchase or conquest is a purchase or conquest of nothing but sovereignty. It is a sovereignty over a people who are never to be admitted to exercise it or to share it.

In the present case we have not, I repeat, bought any property. We have undertaken to buy mere sovereignty. There were no public lands in the Philippine Islands, the property of Spain, which we have bought and paid for. The mountains of iron and the nuggets of gold and the hemp-bearing fields—do you purpose to strip the owners of their rightful title? We have undertaken to buy allegiance, pure and simple. And allegiance is just what the law of nations declares you can not buy. The power of Congress to dispose of the territory or other property of the United States, invoked in this debate, as the foundation of your constitutional right, may carry with it in a proper case a right to the allegiance of the occupant of the soil we own. But we have not bought any property there. The mountains of iron, the nuggets of gold, the hemp-bearing fields, the tobacco and sugar and coffee are not ours, unless holding first that we can buy of Spain an allegiance which this people have shaken off, which Spain could not deliver, which does not exist in justice or in right, we can then go on and say that the Constitution of the United States does not apply to territory, and that we will proceed to take the private property of this people for public use, without their consent.

It is understood that the Filipino people purpose to dispossess the religious orders of their vast real estate possessions. They are Catholics. But they desire to do what Catholic England did long before the Reformation—preventing the engrossment by the church of vast and valuable lands needed by the people. As I understand it, our treaty binds us to confirm those titles, and that is one of the things which has provoked this people to their desperate resistance. Upon the question of the justice of their demand I do not purpose now to enter.

Whether the inestimable and imperishable principles of human liberty are to be trampled down by the American Republic, and whether its great bulwark and fortress, the American Constitution, impregnable from without, is to be betrayed from within, is our question now.

Will any gentleman affirm that the framers of the Constitution, or the people who adopted it, considered as an object and end of their government of limited powers which the Declaration of Independence had declared beyond the just powers of any government and contrary to natural right? Alexander Hamilton says the Declaration of Independence is the fundamental constitution of every State.

I have been unable to find a single reputable authority more than twelve months old for the power now claimed for Congress to govern dependent nations or territories not expected to become States. The contrary, until this war broke out, has been taken as too clear for reasonable question. I content myself with a few authorities. Among them are Daniel Webster, William H. Seward, the Supreme Court of the United States, James Madison.

Daniel Webster said in the Senate March 23, 1848:

Arbitrary governments may have territories and distant possessions, because arbitrary governments may rule them by different laws and different systems. We can do no such thing. They must be of us, part of us, or else strangers. I think I see a course adopted which is likely to turn the Constitution of the land into a deformed monster, into a curse rather than a blessing; in fact, a frame of an unequal government, not founded on popular representation, not founded on equality, but on the grossest inequality; and I think that this process will go on, or that there is danger that it will go on, until this Union shall fall to pieces. I resist it, to-day and always! Whoever falters or whoever flies, I continue the contest!

James Madison said in the *Federalist*:

The object of the Federal Constitution is to secure the union of the thirteen primitive States, which we know to be practicable; and to add to them such other States as may arise in their own bosoms, or in their neighborhood, which we can not doubt will be practicable.—*James Madison, Federalist, No. 14.*

William H. Seward said:

It is a remarkable feature of the Constitution of the United States that its framers never contemplated colonies, or provinces, or territories at all. On the other hand, they contemplated States only, nothing less than States, perfect States, equal States, as they are called here, sovereign States. There is reason—there is sound political wisdom in this provision of the Constitution excluding colonies, which are always subject to oppression, and excluding provinces, which always tend to corrupt and ultimately to break down the parent State.—*Seward's Works, Volume 1, page 122.*

By the Constitution of the United States, there are no subjects. Every citizen of any one State is a free and equal citizen of the United States. Again, by the Constitution of the United States there are no permanent provinces or dependencies.—*Seward's Works, Volume 4, page 167.*

The Supreme Court of the United States, in the case of *Fleming vs. Page*, said:

The genius and character of our institutions are peaceful; and the power to declare war was not conferred upon Congress for the purposes of aggression or aggrandizement, but to enable the Government to vindicate by arms, if it should become necessary, its own rights and the rights of its citizens. A war, therefore, declared by Congress, can never be presumed to be waged for the purpose of conquest or the acquisition of territory; nor does the law declaring the war imply an authority to the President to enlarge the limits of the United States by subjugating the enemy's country.

Our Territories, so far, have all been places where Americans would go to dwell as citizens, to establish American homes, to obtain honorable employment, and to build a State. Will any man go to the Philippine Islands to dwell, except to help govern the people, or to make money by a temporary residence? The men of the Philippines, under the Constitution and the existing laws, may become your fellow-citizens. You will never consent, in the sense of a true citizenship, to become theirs.

Mr. President, our friends who take another view of this question like to tell us of the mistakes of great men of other days, who have vainly protested against acquisition of territory. One worthy and most exuberant gentleman in another place points out to his hearers the folly of Webster and Clay, the delusions of Charles Sumner, and contrasts them with the wisdom of Jefferson and Tyler and Polk. Mr. Jefferson declared that the acquisition of Louisiana was unconstitutional, and wanted a constitutional amendment to justify it. I think the general

sense of the American people is that in that particular Mr. Jefferson was in error, and that our power to admit new States clearly involves the power to acquire territory from which new States are to be made. I wonder, however, if there be any man now alive, who now holds or who ever did or ever will hold a seat in either House of Congress, willing to say that, having taken an oath to support the Constitution, he would, for any purpose of public advantage, forswear himself for the sake of a real or fancied good to his country. I hope and believe that the spirit of Fletcher of Saltoun, who said he would die to serve Scotland, but he would not do a base thing to save her, is still the spirit of American statesmanship. That exuberant gentleman contrasts the statesmanship of Polk and Tyler with that of Daniel Webster and Henry Clay and Charles Sumner. Somehow or other, the names of Webster and Clay and Sumner live in the hearts and on the lips of their countrymen, while the men who brought on the Mexican War in the interest of slavery are forgotten. I do not think we hear of men building statues to those counselors, or celebrating their birthdays, or writing their lives. In all generations, the statesmen who have appealed to righteousness and justice and freedom have left an enduring place in the loving memory of their countrymen, while the men who have counseled them to walk in the path of injustice and wrong, even if it led to empire and even if they were in the majority in their own day, are forgotten and despised. Ah, Mr. President, that gentleman says we are the anointed of the Lord, as the Jews were the anointed of the Lord. But the Jewish empire is forgotten. The sands of the desert cover the foundations of her cities. The spider spins its thread, the owl makes its midnight perch in their palaces. But still those little words, "Thou shalt not steal; thou shalt not covet that that is thy neighbor's; whatever ye would that men shall do to you, do ye even so again unto them," shine through the ages, blazing and undimmed. Mr. President, you may speculate; you may refine; you may doubt; you may deny. But the one foremost action in our history, the foremost action in all history, is the writing upon its pages those simple and sublime opening sentences of the Declaration of Independence. And the men who stand by it shall live in the eternal memory of mankind; and the men who depart from it, however triumphant and successful in their little policies, shall perish and be forgotten, or shall be remembered only to be despised.

When hostilities broke out, February 5, 1899, we had no occupancy of and no title of any kind to any portion of the Philippine territory, except the town and bay of Manila. Everything else was in the peaceful possession of the inhabitants. In such a condition of things, Mr. President, international law speaks to us with its awful mandate. It pronounces your proposed action sheer usurpation and robbery. You have no better title, according to the law of nations, to reduce this people to subjection than you have to subjugate Mexico or Haiti or Belgium or Switzerland.

FORBIDDEN BY INTERNATIONAL LAW.

This is the settled doctrine, as declared by our own great masters of jurisprudence.

You have no right, according to the law of nations, to obtain

by purchase or acquisition sovereignty over a people which is not actually exercised by the country which undertakes to convey it or yield it.

It is a familiar principle of the common law that you can not make a lawful purchase of land, of which the seller is disseized, or of a chattel of which he is dispossessed. The reason of this doctrine is to prevent the purchase of lawsuits. This rule applies with tenfold force to undertaking to purchase human beings when their country and the selling power is dispossessed at the time of the sale, and where the title can only be enforced by war.

We have not yet completed the acquisition. But at the time we entered upon it, and at the time of this alleged purchase, the people of the Philippine Islands, as appears by General Otis's report, by Admiral Dewey's report, and the reports of officers for whom they vouched, held their entire territory, with the exception of the single town of Manila. They had, as appears from these reports, a full organized government. They had an army fighting for independence, admirably disciplined, according to the statement of zealous advocates of expansion.

Why, Mr. President, is it credible that any American statesman, that any American Senator, that any intelligent American citizen anywhere, two years ago could have been found to affirm that a proceeding like that of the Paris treaty could give a just and valid title to sovereignty over a people situated as were the people of those islands? A title of Spain, originally by conquest, never submitted to nor admitted by the people of the islands, with frequent insurrections at different times for centuries, and then the yoke all thrown off, a constitutional government, schools, colleges, churches, universities, hospitals, town governments, a legislature, a cabinet, courts, a code of laws, and the whole island occupied and controlled by its people, with the single exception of one city; with taxes lawfully levied and collected, with an army and the beginning of a navy.

And yet the Senate, the Congress enacted less than two years ago that the people of Cuba-controlling peaceably no part of their island, levying no taxes in any orderly or peaceable way, with no administration of justice, no cabinet—not only of right ought to be, but were, in fact, a free and independent State. I did not give my assent to that declaration of fact. I assented to the doctrine that they of right ought to be. But I thought the statement of fact much calculated to embarrass the Government of the United States, if it were bound by that declaration; and it has been practically disregarded by the Administration ever since. But the question now is a very different one. You not only deny that the Filipinos are, but you deny that they of right ought to be free and independent; and you recognize Spain as entitled to sell to you the sovereignty of an island where she was not at the time occupying a foot of territory, where her soldiers were held captives by the government of the island, a government to which you had delivered over a large number of Spanish prisoners to be held as captives. And yet you come here to-day and say that they not only are not, but they of right ought not to be free and independent; and when you are pressed you answer us by talking about mountains of iron and nuggets of gold, and trade with China.

I affirm that you can not get by conquest, and you can not get by purchase, according to the modern law of nations, according

to the law of nations as accepted and expounded by the United States, sovereignty over a people, or title to a territory, of which the power that undertakes to sell it or the power from whom you undertake to wrest it has not the actual possession and dominion. Under municipal law you can not buy a horse of which the seller is dispossessed; you can not buy a foot of land of which he is disseized. You can not purchase a lawsuit. Under international law you can not buy a people from a power that has no actual dominion over them. You can not buy a war. More than this, you can not buy a tyrant's claim to subject again an oppressed people who have achieved their freedom.

You can not buy the liberties of a people from a dispossessed tyrant, liberties they have bravely won for themselves in arms. You can not buy sovereignty like merchandise and men like sheep. The King of England kept, down to 1800, the title of Duke of Normandy and King of France. Could any other country or all Europe together have bought France of King George? I wonder what would have happened if, instead of acknowledging our independence, any time before the French treaty France had bought England out and undertaken to assert her title to the United States. These questions have to be answered, not amid the shouting and applause of a political campaign, not in party platforms, not alone in a single campaign or a single generation. They have got to be answered to history, to the instructed conscience of the civilized world, when the passions and the greed and the ambitions of a single generation have gone by and are cold. And there will be to them but one answer.

I shall show beyond all question or cavil, from the evidence of our own commanders, that this was a people. They were a people who had taken arms for liberty. They had achieved liberty. They had taken arms to establish a republic. They had established a republic—the first republic of the Orient.

Now, international law has something to say about this matter. Will the American people, for the first time in their history, disregard its august mandates?

You gentlemen who desire to hold on to the Philippine Islands are trying to plant the United States squarely upon this doctrine. You must affirm that a people rising for their own liberties against a tyrant, and having got actual possession of their own territory, and having dispossessed the oppressor, have no rightful title thereto.

Not only are we violating our own Constitution, and the great precepts of the Declaration of Independence which, as the Supreme Court of the United States have declared, is to control and interpret, being, as the Court say, but the letter of which the Declaration of Independence is the spirit, but we are equally violating the accepted precepts of the law of nations as expounded by our own great authorities.

If there be one thing above others which is the glory of the American Republic it is the respect and obedience it has ever paid to international law. It is that law, the product of Christianity which prevents every weak nation on the earth from becoming the prey of the stronger ones. It is to nations what the conscience is to the individual soul. It finds its enforcement and sanction in the public opinion of the civilized world, a power, according to Mr. Webster, stronger than armies or navies. No nation escapes the penalty of its infraction. As Mr. Webster says, it pursues the conqueror to the very scene of his ovation and

wounds him with the sting that belongs to the consciousness of having outraged the opinion of mankind.

The late Secretary of State, Mr. Day, the head of the commission that negotiated the treaty at Paris, has quite lately publicly disclaimed any title to the Philippine Archipelago by conquest. I think, although there have been some hasty statements to that effect, the theory of title by conquest will find few advocates in this chamber. It is a theory opposed alike to all the traditions of the Republic and to all the mandates of morality.

Mr. Justice Gray says, in his opinion in the case of *The Paquete Habana* and *The Lola* (U. S. Rep., vol. 175):

International law is part of our law, and must be ascertained and administered by the courts of justice of appropriate jurisdiction, as often as questions of right depending upon it are duly presented for their determination.

Such works are resorted to by judicial tribunals, not for the speculations of their authors concerning what the law ought to be, but for trustworthy evidence of what the law really is.—*Hilton v. Guyot*, 159 U. S., 113, 163, 164, 214, 215.

They are witnesses of the sentiments and usages of civilized nations, and the weight of their testimony increases every time that their authority is invoked by statesmen, and every year that passes without the rules laid down in their works being impugned by the avowal of contrary principles.—*Wheaton's International Law* (8th edition), section 15.

In cases where the principal jurists agree, the presumption will be very great in favor of the solidity of their maxims; and no civilized nation that does not arrogantly set all ordinary law and justice at defiance will venture to disregard the uniform sense of the established writers on international law.—1 *Kent Com.*, 18.

Our fathers used to think John Locke pretty good authority in the ethics of freedom. Bacon, and Newton, and Locke still hold their place as the greatest of English philosophers. You will find him cited pretty often in the great debates that preceded the Revolution and the discussions when our national and State constitutions were set up. This is what he says:

Over those, then, that joined with him in the war, and over those of the subdued country that opposed him not, and the posterity even of those that did, the conqueror, even in a just war, hath, by his conquest, no right of dominion; they are free from any subjection to him, and if their former government be dissolved, they are at liberty to begin and erect another to themselves.

The conqueror, it is true, usually by the force he has over them, compels them, with the sword at their breast, to stoop to his conditions, and submit to such a government as he pleased to afford them; but the inquiry is, what right has he to do so? If it be said they submit by their own consent, then this allows their own consent to be necessary to give the conqueror a title to rule over them. It remains only to be considered whether promises extorted by force without right can be thought consent, and how far they bind. To which I shall say, they bind not at all; because whatsoever another gets from me by force, I still retain the right of, and he is obliged presently to restore.—*Locke on Civil Government*, part 2, sections 185, 186.

Now, Mr. President, is there any truth in this? Is this a revolutionary pronunciamento or is it doctrine to which—whatever monarchical governments may have to say—the American people are committed by all their traditions and by all their history?

From many authorities I will cite a few.

First, President McKinley, in the language so often quoted. When the President said that—

Forcible annexation, according to our American code of morals, would be criminal aggression—

was he a copperhead? Was he disloyal to the flag? Was not he Republican? Was there ever an utterance so calculated to give courage to Aguinaldo and his people as that?

When he said—

Human rights and constitutional privileges must not be forgotten in the race for wealth and commercial supremacy. The Government of the people must be by the people and not by a few of the people. It must rest upon the free consent

of the governed and all of the governed. Power, it must be remembered, which is secured by oppression or usurpation or by any form of injustice is soon dethroned. We have no right in law or morals to usurp that which belongs to another, whether it is property or power—

was he a traitor?

I suppose Chancellor Kent is recognized everywhere as the ablest American writer of jurisprudence, unless some of us were to agree with Kent himself, in assigning the superiority to Story. Judge Kent's language, which I myself have quoted elsewhere, has been quoted already more than once in this debate. He says:

Full sovereignty can not be held to have passed by the mere words of the treaty without actual delivery. To complete the right of property, the right to the thing and the possession of the thing must be united. This is a necessary principle in the law of property in all systems of jurisprudence. \*

This general law of property applies to the right of territory no less than to other rights. The practice of nations has been conformable to this principle, and the conventional law of nations is full of instances of this kind. (Page 178.)

The same doctrine is stated by Halleck, International Law, vol. 2, p. 472, and by Phillimore Commentaries upon International Law, vol. 3, p. 871.

Halleck says:

The rule of public law, with respect to the allegiance of the inhabitants of a conquered territory, is no longer to be interpreted as meaning that it is absolutely and unconditionally acquired by conquest, or transferred and handed over by treaty, as a thing assignable by contract, and without the assent of the subject. On the contrary, the express or implied consent of the subject is now regarded as essential to a complete new allegiance."

Sumner said in his speech before the Republican State convention of Massachusetts in 1869:

And he knows our country little, and little also of that great liberty of ours, who supposes that we could receive such a transfer. On each side there is impossibility. Territory may be conveyed, but not a people.

Next. Shurston Baker, whose admirable treatise on international law has just been published in Boston. He says:

In modern times sales and transfers of national territory to another power can only be made by treaty or some solemn act of the sovereign authority of the state. And such transfers of territory do not include the allegiance of its inhabitants without their consent, express or implied.

At page 355 the same author says:

The rule of public law with respect to the allegiance of the inhabitants of a conquered territory is therefore no longer to be interpreted as meaning that it is absolutely and unconditionally acquired by conquest, or transferred and handed over by a treaty as a thing assignable by contract and without the assent of the subject. On the contrary, the express or implied assent of the subject is now regarded as essential to a complete new allegiance.

If the inhabitants of the ceded conquered territory choose to leave it on its transfer and to adhere to their former sovereign, they have, in general, a right to do so.

The *status* of the inhabitants of the conquered and transferred territory is thus determined by their own choice.

In the cases arising out of the Revolution by which the North American colonies of Great Britain became an independent state it was considered to be an established maxim of public and international law that there was vested in an individual a *right of electing* to remain under the old or of contracting a new allegiance. The choice must be made within a reasonable period of time.

In order to make a transfer of property valid, the authority, whether *de facto* or *de jure*, must be competent to bind the state. Hence the necessity of examining into and ascertaining the powers of the rulers, as the municipal constitutions of different states throw many difficulties in the way of alienations of their public property, and particularly of their territory. Especially, in modern times, the consent of the governed, express or implied, is necessary before the transfer of their allegiance can regularly take place.

But why multiply citations to a Senate who, within two years, affirmed that Cuba of right ought to be free and independent, and to a Congress and a President that declared war to make that

declaration good? You were stating a doctrine of public law, were you not? You were not uttering a lying revolutionary pronciamento. You were speaking for a great nation, on a solemn occasion. You were speaking words of truth and soberness, words you meant to make good with the lives of your sons. The first and the last declaration of public law ever made by the American people, the declaration of 1776 and the declaration of 1898, are in full accord and harmony. They both justify the Philippine people and condemn us.

I know that in that archipelago of 1,200 islands there are many tribes and races. There are wild men, pagans, who probably never heard of Spain. There are islands over which Spain never exercised power. There are Mahometans, polygamists ruled by a sultan, whose polygamous despotism we are now supporting. We can buy our peace with him, although we can not even treat for peace with the men whom our military commanders promised independence. But I am pleading for that Christian people who won their freedom from Spain and established free government over Luzon and the Visayas, a goverment as stable and unquestioned as that of any American State during our Revolution.

THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE.

The Declaration of Independence is not so much a declaration of rights as a declaration of duties. It prescribes a rule of conduct for men in the same state to one another and for the nations of the earth to one another. Like the golden rule, it makes the law of individual right the law also of individual duty. Do Senators reflect how this "imperialism," as they call it, is inaugurating a revolution not only in the law of nations, not only in the fundamental law by which the people of the United States have governed themselves until now, not only in the interpretation of the Constitution, but in the moral law itself? As I hear the utterances of some worthy gentlemen taking the name of God upon their lips, it seems to me as if they thought the balance of the universe itself had changed within this year, and that God had gone over to the side of Satan.

There is one question I should like to put to the Republican majority in the Senate and to the Republican party in the country: Is this doctrine true or is it false? Are you to stand on it any longer or are you going to whistle it down the wind?

Thomas Jefferson declared it, this precise doctrine now at stake here. John Quincy Adams reaffirmed it again and again. Abraham Lincoln said he was willing to be assassinated for it. Charles Sumner was almost assassinated for it in his place in the Senate Chamber. Republican national conventions in 1856 and in 1860 and in later years have reaffirmed it again and again. President McKinley, two years ago, made the most extreme statement of it to be found in literature.

Now, either this thing is true or it is a lying pretense. If it be a lying pretense, the country has stood on a lie during its whole history. If it be true, the country is dishonored when we depart from it. For myself, I believe it is true; I have tried to live by it; I am contented to die by it; my love of country rests on it; my pride of ancestry rests on it. To me that is what the flag symbolizes and stands for.

I believe that utterance made at Philadelphia in 1776 to have been the greatest evangel that ever came to mankind since the

story of Bethlehem. Like the shot fired at Concord, it was heard round the world. It was heard with fear in the palace of the tyrant; it was heard with joy in the huts where poor men dwelt. I reverently believe it was heard with joy in heaven itself.

I believe, also, that if the gloss put upon that great declaration by the Senator from Connecticut had been uttered then it would have been received with a burst of derisive laughter in hell, and Satan himself would have led the chorus.

We have had so far some fundamental doctrine, some ideals to which this people has been devoted. Have you anything to give us in their place? You are trying to knock out the corner stones. Is there any material from your swamp and mud and morass from which you can make a new foundation for our temple?

Gentlemen tell us that the bill of the Senator from Wisconsin is copied from that introduced in Jefferson's time for the purchase of Louisiana. Do you claim that you propose to deal with these people as Jefferson meant to deal with Louisiana? You talk of Alaska, of Florida, of California; do you mean to deal with the Philippines as we mean to deal with Alaska and dealt with Florida or California?

It was safe to give Jefferson—who thought it wicked to govern a people against its will—a power with which gentlemen who think it is right ought never to be trusted.

I have spoken of the Declaration of Independence as a solemn affirmation of public law, but it is far more than that. It is a solemn pledge of national faith and honor. It is a baptismal vow. It is the bedrock of our republican institutions. It is, as the Supreme Court declared, the soul and spirit of which the Constitution is but the body and letter. It is the light by which the Constitution must be read. The statesman or the party who will not stand by the Declaration and obey it is never to be trusted anywhere to keep an oath to support the Constitution. To such a statesman, whenever his ambition or his passion shall incline him, to such a party, whenever its fancied advantage shall tempt it, there will be no constitutional restraint. It will bend the Constitution to its desire, never its desire to the Constitution. *Constitutio ad causam accommodatur, non causa ad constitutionem.*

There is expansion enough in it, but it is the expansion of freedom and not of depotism; of life, not of death. Never was such growth in all human history as that from the seed Thomas Jefferson planted. The parable of the mustard seed, than which, as Edward Everett said, "the burning pen of inspiration, ranging heaven and earth for a similitude, can find nothing more appropriate or expressive to which to liken the Kingdom of God," is repeated again. "Whereunto shall we liken it, or with what comparison shall we compare it? It is like a grain of mustard seed, which, when it is sown in the earth, is less than all the seeds that be in the earth.

"But when it is sown, it groweth up, and becometh greater than all herbs, and shooteth out great branches, so that the fowls of the air may lodge under the shadow of it." This is the expansion of Thomas Jefferson. It has covered the continent. It is on both the seas. It has saved South America. It is revolutionizing Europe. It is the expansion of freedom. It differs from your tinsel, pinchbeck, pewter expansion as the growth of a healthy youth into a strong man differs from the expansion of an

anaconda when he swallows his victim. Ours is the expansion of Thomas Jefferson. Yours is the expansion of Aaron Burr. It is destined to as short a life and to a like fate.

Until within two years the American people have been wont to appeal to the Declaration of Independence as the foremost State paper in history. As the years go round the Fourth of July has been celebrated wherever Americans could gather together, at home or abroad. To have signed it, to an American, was better than a title of nobility. It was no passionate utterance of a hasty enthusiasm. There was nothing of the radical in it; nothing of Rousseau; nothing of the French Revolution. It was the sober utterance of the soberest men of the soberest generation that ever lived. It was the declaration of a religious people at the most religious period of their history. It was a declaration not merely of rights but of duties. It was an act not of revolution but of construction. It was the corner stone, the foundation stone of a great national edifice wherein the American people were to dwell forevermore. The language was the language of Thomas Jefferson. But the thought was the thought of everyone of his associates. The men of the Continental Congress meant to plant their new nation on eternal verities which no man possessed by the spirit of liberty could ever thereafter undertake to challenge. As the Christian religion was rested by its author on two sublime commandments on which hang all the laws and the prophets, so these men rested republican liberty on two sublime verities on which it must stand, if it can stand at all; in which it must live or bear no life. One was the equality of the individual man with every other in political right. The other is that you are now seeking to overthrow—the right of every people to institute their own government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness, and so to assume among the powers of the earth the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them. Equality of individual manhood and equality of individual states. This is the doctrine which the Republican party is now urged to deny.

To justify that denial the advocates of the policy of imperialism are driven to the strange affirmation that Thomas Jefferson did not believe it and contradicted it when he purchased Louisiana; that John Quincy Adams did not believe it and contradicted it when he bought Florida; that Abraham Lincoln did not believe it and contradicted it when he put down the rebellion; that Charles Sumner did not believe it and contradicted it when he bought Alaska. They say that because, with the full and practical consent of the men who occupied them, these men bought great spaces of territory occupied by sparse and scattered populations, neither owning it nor pretending to own it, not capable of occupying it or governing it, destitute of every single attribute which makes or can make a nation or a people, those statesmen of ours, designing to make the territory acquired into equal States, to be dwelt in and governed under our Constitution by men with rights equal to our own—that therefore you may get by purchase or by conquest an unwilling people, occupying and governing a thickly settled territory, possessing every attribute of a national life, enjoying a freedom they have themselves achieved; that you may crush out their national life; that you may overthrow their institutions; that you may strangle their freedom; that you may

put over them governors whom you appoint and in whose appointment they have no voice; that you may make laws for them in your interest and not in theirs; that you may overthrow their republican liberty, and in doing this you appeal to the example of Thomas Jefferson and John Quincy Adams and Abraham Lincoln and Charles Sumner.

Thomas Jefferson comes down in history with the Declaration of Independence in one hand and the title deed of Louisiana in the other. Do you think his left hand knew not what his right hand did? Do you think these two immortal transactions contradicted each other? Do you think he bought men like sheep and paid for them in gold? It is true the men of the Declaration held slaves. Jefferson felt the inconsistency, and declared that he trembled for his country when he felt that God was just. But he lived and died in the expectation that the Declaration would abolish slavery, *as it did*.

In every accession of territory to this country ever made we recognized fully the doctrine of the consent of the governed and the doctrine that territory so acquired must be held to be made into States. The men who say that Jefferson violated the doctrine of the Declaration when he bought Louisiana, and John Quincy Adams when he acquired Florida, and Sumner when he made his great speech for Alaska, might, with as much reason, justify a rape by citing the precedent of every lawful marriage that has taken place since the beginning of time.

The confusion of the argument of our friends on the other side comes from confounding the statement in the Declaration of the rights of individuals with the statement of the rights of nations, or peoples, in dealing with one another.

The whole Declaration is a statement of political rights and political relations and political duties.

First. Every man is equal in political rights, including the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, to every other.

Second. No people can come under the government of any other people, or of any ruler, without its consent. The law of nature and of nature's God entitle every people to its separate and equal station among the powers of the earth. Our fathers were not dealing in this clause with the doctrine of the social compact; they were not considering the rights of minorities; they used the word "people" as equivalent to "nation," or "state," as an organized political being, and not as a mere aggregate of persons not collected or associated. They were not thinking of Robinson Crusoe in his desolate island, or of scattered settlers, still less of predatory bands roaming over vast regions they could neither own nor occupy. They were affirming the right of each of the thirteen colonies separately or of all together to throw off the yoke of George III and to separate itself or themselves from Great Britain. Now, you must either admit that what they said was true, or you must affirm the contrary.

The question is put, with an air of triumph, as if it were somehow hard to answer, If this doctrine of yours apply to a million men why does it not apply to a hundred men? At what point in the census do men get these God-given rights of yours? Well, the answer is easy enough. Our fathers, in the affirmation of the Declaration of Independence you are now denying, were speaking of the equal rights of nations, of their duties to each other. The exact point where a few scattered settlements become

a people, or a few nomadic tribes a nation, may not admit of precise mathematical definition. At what point does a brook become a river? When does a pond become a lake, or a lake a sea, or a breeze a hurricane? You can not tell me. But surely there are nations and peoples, there is organized national life; and there are scattered habitations and wandering tribes to whom these titles are never applied. Louisiana, Florida, Alaska, New Mexico, California, neither had, nor did their inhabitants claim to have, such a national vitality when we annexed them. And if there were anything of that sort when we annexed them, it desired to come to us. And it came to us to become part of us—bone of our bone, flesh of our flesh, life of our life, soul of our soul.

But I can give you two pretty safe practical rules, quite enough for this day's purpose. Each of them will solve your difficulty, if you have a difficulty, and want to solve it. That is a people, that is a power of the earth, that is a nation entitled as such to its separate and equal station among the powers of the earth by the laws of nature and of nature's God, that has a written constitution, a settled territory, an independence it has achieved, an organized army, a congress, courts, schools, universities, churches, the Christian religion, a village life in orderly, civilized, self-governed municipalities; a pure family life, newspapers, books, statesmen who can debate questions of international law, like Mabini, and organize governments, like Aguinaldo; poets like José Rizal; aye, and patriots who can die for liberty, like José Rizal. The Boer republic is a nation, and it is a crime to crush out its life, though its population be less than that of Providence, R. I. Each one of our old thirteen States would have been a nation, even if it had stood alone. And the Philippine republic, with twenty times the number of the Boers, a people more than the whole thirteen States who joined in the Declaration put together, is a nation, and it is a greater crime still to crush out its life.

There is another rule that will help any Senator out of his difficulty. It must be a comfort to every one of you in his perplexity. Every people is of right entitled to its independence that has got as far as Cuba had in the spring of 1898. You all admit that. Admit! You all avow, affirm, strenuously insist on that. You will all pledge your lives and fortunes and sacred honor for that. You will go to war and send your sons to war to maintain that. If Spain shall deny it, or any other country but Great Britain, woe be to her. It isn't necessary, according to you, to have a constitution; it isn't necessary to have courts; it isn't necessary to have a capital; it isn't necessary to have a school. The seat of government may be in the saddle. It isn't necessary to occupy a city, or to have a seaport; it isn't necessary to hold permanently an acre of land; it isn't necessary to have got the invader out of the country; it isn't necessary to have a tenth part of the claim the Filipinos have, or to have done a tenth part of the things the Filipinos have done. You settled all this for yourselves and for the country long ago—March 10, 1898. So I assume you have only put this conundrum for the pleasure of answering it yourselves.

Mr. Jefferson estimates the population of Louisiana at the time of the purchase at 42,375, in his communication to Congress. Its area in square miles was 1,182,752, one person to 27 square miles. But Gayarre, the best recent authority, estimates the population at about 20,000, or less than one person to 50 square miles.

The population of Florida at the time of the annexation was

about 30,000. At the first census thereafter, it was 34,725, making a little more than one inhabitant to 2 square miles.

A convention of the people of Florida petitioned for the protection of the United States as an integral part of the United States; and it is notorious that the inhabitants were eager for annexation.

In the case of Louisiana, the settlers at New Orleans objected. Those at St. Louis and the other ports were willing. But the settlers at New Orleans were, many of them, sojourners only, designing to return to France. And France, as Napoleon well knew, was totally unable to hold them against England.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts will suspend a moment while the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 2355) in relation to the suppression of insurrection in, and to the government of, the Philippine Islands, ceded by Spain to the United States by the treaty concluded at Paris on the 10th day of December, 1898.

Mr. HOAR. I have the authority of my colleague, who is in charge of the bill, to ask that the unfinished business be informally laid aside.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside. Without objection it will be so ordered.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, no man can read for a moment Mr. Sumner's great speech in executive session and claim that it is in the least a departure from the doctrines of the Declaration of Independence, or a precedent for the conquest or purchase of the Philippine Islands. Mr. Sumner declares that upon this region of more than 570,000 square miles, with 4,000 statute miles of coast, innumerable islands, and a coast line, including bays and islands, not less than 11,270 miles in length, there are but 54,000 inhabitants according to the most accurate estimate. He declares there is no government there; that Russia's control is but nominal; that in many maps of the Russian Empire the territory is not contained. Her government, he says, is little more than a name or a shadow. It is not even a skeleton. It is hardly visible. Its only representative is a fur company, to which has been added latterly an ice company. The immense country is without form and without light; without activity and without progress. Distant from the imperial capital and separated from the huge bulk of the Russian Empire, it does not share the vitality of a common country. Its life is solitary and feeble. Its settlements are only encampments or lodges. Its fisheries are only a petty perquisite belonging to local or personal adventurers rather than to the commerce of nations. He quotes Alexander Humboldt, who says: "The Russian factories on the American continent are, for the most part, mere collections of sheds and cabins, but serving as storehouses for the fur trade." Humboldt adds that we must not think that these places are Russian provinces in the sense given to the word in speaking of Spanish provinces.

The price, \$7,500,000, paid for 570,000 square miles of territory shows that it was but a waste and desolate place, without national life; without a people in any true sense of the word; without any inhabitants possessing or claiming a title beyond their petty huts or temporary dwelling places. And, Mr. President, Mr. Sumner puts forward as the chief motive for acquiring Alaska the expansion of republican institutions, which, he says, is our traditional

aspiration. It was in this spirit that independence was achieved, and that it is in the name of human rights, the same in which our fathers overthrew the kingly power, that this acquisition is to be made. He quotes John Adams, saying that our State governments are destined to spread over the northern part of this whole quarter of the globe. He adds that we are to guarantee a republican form of government to them, and that Russia is now, with France and Spain, giving way to the absorbing unity declared in the national motto, "E Pluribus Unum."

Mr. Sumner enters in his speech what he styles a "caveat." This treaty must not be a precedent for a system of indiscriminate and costly annexion. He says that every stage in our predetermined future must be by natural processes, without war, and, he would add, even without purchase. Our triumph must be by growth and organic expansion, recognizing always the will of those who become our fellow-citizens. Our acquisitions, he says, will be under the sanction of wedlock to the Republic.

Mr. Sumner, as I said just now, estimated the population at 54,000, or one inhabitant to about 11 square miles, divided into four groups—Eskimo, Aleutians, who are of Mongolian origin; Kenaians and Koloschians, who are American Indians. Some of them are warlike; some gentle and pacific; all slaveholders; some cannibals. Mr. Sumner ends his speech with affirming "that we are to give to this territory republican government, which, looking to a long future, we shall organize with free schools and equal laws, before which every citizen will stand erect in the consciousness of manhood. Bestow such a government, and you will give what is better than all you can receive, whether quintals of fish, sands of gold, choicest fur, or most beautiful ivory."

In the case of Hawaii a constitution had been maintained in peace for five years, in spite of Mr. Cleveland's known inclination to interfere for its overthrow. There was an express provision authorizing the Government to make a treaty of annexation with us.

In the case of the provinces acquired from Mexico, there was no population capable of a separate national life, and there was at least no reason to believe that the people dissented.

But in the present case you have a clear, sharp question put to the conscience of the people: Will you by force of arms or by purchase get territory belonging to an unwilling people, numbering millions, for the purpose of holding them in subjugation forever—a people who had achieved their own independence, had a government established in order and in peace, who are so opposed to your rule that they are willing to die in an almost hopeless resistance to it?

I repeat. In every acquisition of territory we ever made we meant to make States of it. Jefferson expressly says so in his Louisiana message. There was no nation owning and dwelling on the territory; no people in the sense of the Declaration; no organized national life; and certainly, in every case but Louisiana, we had reason to believe that the few scattered dwellers in the territory approved the transaction.

Mr. Seward said of California:

California yielded to persuasion rather than to conquest. She renounced her lineage, language, and ancient loyalty. (Seward's Works, volume 1, page 9.)

There are other arguments, if they are to be called arguments, which would hardly be deemed worthy of consideration were it

not that they have been given a wide circulation by the imperialistic press.

One says, You imprison criminals, and therefore your Government does not rest upon the consent of the governed. Another says, You subdued the Southern rebellion, and therefore you govern people without their consent. In the case of the Southern rebellion, if all the people of any State, without distinction of color or race, had been counted, there was not one where the majority was not in favor of the Union. In the case of the Southern rebellion, the rebellion was by States against a government which the insurgents had aided in establishing, and against the Constitution which they had declared should be the supreme law of the land, anything in the constitution or laws of any particular State to the contrary, notwithstanding.

But it is hardly worth while to undertake to notice arguments which are not themselves addressed to the reason, and which I do not believe ever convince those who utter them, although sometimes in the excitement of crowded audiences they pass current with those who hear them.

You have tried governing men of other races than your own at home for a hundred years. You have dealt with the Indian, you have dealt with the negro, close at hand, knowing all about them. I suppose you feel encouraged by your success. There are ten million of them. And now you go forth to lay your yoke on ten million more, 7,000 miles away, of whom you know nothing. You go forth jauntily and boastingly, as Louis Napoleon went to meet his doom at Sedan.

AGUINALDO, BRAVE, HONEST, AND PATRIOTIC.

Senators, if there were no Constitution, if there were no Declaration, if there were no international law, if there were nothing but the history of the past two years, the American people would be bound in honor, if there be honor, bound in common honesty, if there be honesty, not to crush out this Philippine republic, and not to wrest from this people its independence. The history of our dealing with the Philippine people is found in the reports of our commanders. It is all contained in our official documents, and in published statements of General Anderson and in the speeches of the President. It is little known to the country to-day. When it shall be known, I believe it will cause a revolution in public sentiment.

There are 1,200 islands in the Philippine group. They extend as far as from Maine to Florida. They have a population variously estimated at from 8,000,000 to 12,000,000. There are wild tribes who never heard of Christ, and islands that never heard of Spain. But among them are the people of the island of Luzon, numbering 3,500,000, and the people of the Visayan Islands, numbering 2,500,000 more. They are a Christian and civilized people. They wrested their independence from Spain and established a republic. Their rights are no more to be affected by the few wild tribes in their own mountains or by the dwellers in the other islands than the rights of our old thirteen States were affected by the French in Canada, or the Six Nations of New York, or the Cherokee of Georgia, or the Indians west of the Mississippi. Twice our commanding generals, by their own confession, assured these people of their independence. Clearly and beyond all cavil we formed an alliance with them. We expressly asked them to cooperate

with us. We handed over our prisoners to their keeping; we sought their help in caring for our sick and wounded. We were told by them again and again and again that they were fighting for independence. Their purpose was as well known to our generals, to the War Department, and to the President, as the fact that they were in arms. We never undeceived them until the time when hostilities were declared in 1899. The President declared again and again that we had no title and claimed no right to anything beyond the town of Manila. Hostilities were begun by us at a place where we had no right to be, and were continued by us in spite of Aguinaldo's disavowal and regret and offer to withdraw to a line we should prescribe. If we crush that republic, despoil that people of their freedom and independence, and subject them to our rule, it will be a story of shame and dishonor.

Is it right, is it just, to subjugate this people? To substitute our Government for their self-government, for the constitution they have proclaimed and established, a scheme of government such as we could devise ten thousand miles away?

Is it right to put over them officers whom we are to select and they are to obey and pay?

Is it right to make tariffs for our interests and not theirs?

Are the interests of the Manila tobacco grower to be decided upon hearings given to the tobacco raisers of the Connecticut River valley?

Are these mountains of iron, and nuggets of gold, and stores of coal, and hemp-bearing fields, and fruit-bearing gardens to be looked upon by our legislators with covetous eyes?

Is it our wealth or their wealth these things are to increase?

There are other pregnant questions, some of which perhaps require a little examination and a little study of the reports of our commanders.

Had they rightfully achieved their independence when hostilities began between us and them?

Did they forfeit their independence by the circumstances of the war?

On the whole, have they not shown that they are fit for self-government, fit as Cuba, fit as Greece, fit as Spain, fit as Japan, fit as Haiti or San Domingo, fit as any country to the south of us, from the Rio Grande to Cape Horn, was when, with our approval, those countries won their liberties from Spain?

Can we rightfully subjugate a people because we think them unfit for self-government?

Said Sir James Mackintosh when the partition of Poland was going on:

There is no political doctrine more false or pernicious than that which represents vice in its internal government as an extenuation of unjust aggression against a country, and a consolation to mankind for the destruction of its independence. As no government is without great faults, such a doctrine multiplies the grounds of war, gives an unbounded scope to ambition, and furnishes benevolent pretexts for every sort of rapine.

The people of the Philippine Islands have never submitted themselves willingly to Spain. There has been no time for two centuries when they would not have been free from the yoke if they could. Their history has been a history of cruelty and oppression on one side, of resistance and the aspiration for freedom on the other.

In 1896 a rebellion broke out, headed by Aguinaldo. His people were unarmed and poor. The difficulty of communication in a country without roads made combination impossible against a power that commanded the sea and the seaports. Still, the revolt was formidable enough to compel Spain to make promises of reform and redress of grievances. Aguinaldo, seeing that a continued strife would cost much suffering, many lives, and in all likelihood defeat in the end, accepted Spain's promise of amendment and agreed that the principal leaders of the rebellion, their wives, widows, and children, should go into exile and that Spain should make some provision for their support.

Spain was faithless to her promise of reform and paid over only part of the money. This transaction has been much criticised here, but, in my judgment, it leaves no stain on the honesty or patriotism of the insurgent chief. There is no evidence that he profited himself by the transaction or expended a penny of the money for his own use. The transaction was, as circumstances then were, for the interest of his people.

Many advocates of imperialism who have investigated the matter have declared their confidence in Aguinaldo's integrity. Mr. Schurman, president of the commission, told his students at Cornell when he got home that Aguinaldo was an honest and a patriotic man. Our consuls bear this same testimony.

Mr. Williams, United States consul-general at Manila, under date of March 28, 1898, says:

Rebellion never more threatening to Spain. Rebels getting money, arms, and friends, and they outnumber the Spaniards a hundred to one.

March 21, 1898, he writes of the desertion of an entire regiment of the Spanish forces to the insurgents, and adds:

Now five thousand armed rebels, who for days have been in camp near Manila and have been reenforced from the mountains, plan to attack the city to-night.

On April 28, 1898, Mr. Pratt wrote a letter to Mr. Day, in which he speaks of "learning from General Aguinaldo the state and object sought to be obtained, which, though absent from the Philippines, he was directing."

Mr. Pratt further says in a letter to Secretary Day:

General Aguinaldo impressed me as a man of intellectual ability, courage, and worthy of the confidence that had been placed in him.

He says further:

No close observer of what has transpired in the Philippines during the past four years could have failed to recognize that General Aguinaldo enjoyed, above all others, the confidence of the Philippine insurgents and the respect alike of the Spanish and foreigners in the islands, all of whom vouched for his justice and high sense of honor.

Mr. Williams wrote Mr. Moore on July 18, 1898:

General Aguinaldo, Agoncillo, and Sandico are all men who would be leaders in their separate departments in any country.

I have studied as well as I could the character and career of Aguinaldo. I do not compare him with Washington. To Americans there is one character too lofty, one name too sacred, for parallel or comparison. But I believe he is to take a high rank hereafter among the men who have lived and died for liberty. He deserves to be remembered with that small band who have given life, and everything dearer than life, to their country in a losing cause.

To his loved land he gave, without a stain,  
Courage and faith, vain faith, and courage vain.

He shall live with Kossuth, with Oom Paul, with Joubert, with Emmett, with Egmont and Horn, with Nathan Hale, with Warren, with all the great martyrs of history whose blood hath been the seed of the church of liberty.

He, subtle, strong, and stubborn, gave his life  
To a lost cause, and knew the gift was vain.  
Later shall rise a people sane and great,  
Forged in strong fires, by equal war made one,  
Telling old battles over without hate,  
Noble, his name shall pass from sire to son.

On June 11, 1898, Consul Pratt writes to Aguinaldo from Singapore:

I wrote fully to Admiral Dewey concerning you, and to the American Government have pointed out that you and you alone were equal to the occasion.

Consul-General Wildman writes to Aguinaldo from Hongkong June 25, 1898, calling upon him to stand shoulder to shoulder with the American forces, saying:

I have vouched for your honesty and earnestness of purpose to the President of the United States and to our people, and they are ready to extend their hand to you as a brother and aid you in every laudable ambition. I give you my assurance that you can always call upon me to act as your champion should any try to slander your name.

Do not forget that the United States undertook this war for the sole purpose of relieving the Cubans from the cruelties under which they were suffering, and not for the love of conquest or the hope of gain. They are actuated by precisely the same feelings toward the Filipinos. Whatever the final disposition of the conquered territory may be, you can trust the United States that justice and honor will control all their dealings with you.

On the 14th of July, 1898, he writes to Aguinaldo:

You have certainly fulfilled nobly all the promises I made on your behalf to Admiral Dewey.

I am glad to see that our commissioners, in their report, do not indorse the thoroughly refuted slander that Aguinaldo accepted any money from the Spaniards for his own purposes. But the revolution was compromised by an agreement with the leaders of the insurrection to withdraw from the island, and the promise from the Spaniards that the people should have representation in the Cortes of Spain; that the friars should be sent away; that the right of association and a free press should be enjoyed.

These promises were all broken. "The civil guard began to whip and to shoot and abuse the people as before; and it is stated that in the province of Manila more than 200 were executed. The money that had been paid to the rebel leaders was at once converted into a fund for a new revolution." The transaction, on the whole, seems not to have been disadvantageous to the Filipinos, who, our commissioners say, had a great many soldiers, but had only about 800 small arms, consisting of rifles, shotguns, and a few cannon of antiquated models. The fund that had been obtained from the Spaniards was invested in modern arms of approved pattern. On the 1st of May, 1898, Admiral Dewey destroyed the Spanish fleet, and on the 19th of the same month Aguinaldo came, and brought thirteen of his staff with him, and was allowed to land at Cavite and organize an army.

The junior Senator from Colorado, in a manly speech with much of which I find myself in hearty accord, says that Aguinaldo is brave, honest, and patriotic. I am glad to congratulate the Senate that at least one voice has been found among the supporters of the policy of imperialism to do justice to a gallant enemy. President Schurman has borne to him a like tribute. These gentlemen, at least, have had clearness of sight enough to see that

the men who try to disgrace the name of Aguinaldo are disgracing Admiral Dewey and President McKinley. Either Aguinaldo is brave, honest, and patriotic, or the great Admiral, with the approval of the great President, brought over and armed a traitor and a hireling and put him at the head of the men who were then our allies in arms.

Why, Mr. President, the men who chatter so glibly in newspapers, and, I am sorry to say, sometimes in the Senate, do not seem to reflect that they are contradicted by the conduct of the people of the Philippine Islands, by the conduct of Admiral Dewey himself.

The Philippine masses, from the beginning until this hour, have been most loyal to this chieftain.

\* \* \* General MacArthur, one of the bravest American commanders in the Philippines, declared a few months ago: "When I first started in against these rebels I believed that Aguinaldo's troops represented only a faction. I did not like to believe that the whole population of Luzon—the native population—was opposed to us. But having come thus far, after having occupied several towns and cities in succession, and having been brought into contact with both 'insurrectos' and 'amigos,' I have been reluctantly compelled to believe that the Filipino masses are loyal to Aguinaldo and the government which he heads."

I give an extract from an address by the Filipino leaders just after Aguinaldo landed, published by Murat Halstead in his "Story of the Philippines":

In exchange for the loftiness of mind with which Señor Aguinaldo has rigidly carried out the terms of the peace agreement, General Primo de Rivera had the cynicism to state in the congress of his nation that he had promised no reform to Señor Aguinaldo and his army, but that he had only given them a piece of bread in order that they might be able to maintain themselves abroad. This was reechoed in the foreign press, and Señor Aguinaldo was accused in the Spanish press of having allowed himself to be bought with a handful of gold, selling out his country at the same time. There were published, moreover, in those Spanish periodicals, caricatures of Señor Aguinaldo which profoundly wounded his honor and his patriotism.

Señor Aguinaldo and the other revolutionists who reside in Hongkong agreed not to take out one cent of the \$400,000 deposited in the chartered banks and the Hongkong and Shanghai Bank, the only amount which Señor Aguinaldo received from the Spanish Government on account of the stipulated indemnity, but to use it for arms in order to carry on another revolution in the Philippines in case the Spanish Government should fail to carry out the peace agreement, at least in so far as it refers to general amnesty and reforms. All the above-named revolutionists, Señor Aguinaldo setting the example, resolved to deny themselves every kind of comfort during their stay in Hongkong, living in the most modest style, for the purpose of preventing a reduction by one single cent of the above-named sum of \$400,000, which they set aside exclusively for the benefit of their country.

#### LAWSUIT BETWEEN DON J. ARTACHO AND DON E. AGUINALDO.

Señor Artacho, induced by the father solicitor of the Dominicans and the consul-general of Spain, filed in the courts of that colony a summons against Don E. Aguinaldo, asking for a division of the above-mentioned \$400,000 between those revolutionary chiefs who resided in Hongkong. Artacho and three others, who joined the revolution in its last days and rendered little service to it, were the only ones who desired a division of this money; whereas forty-seven revolutionaries, many of whom were most distinguished chiefs, were opposed to it, supporting the resolution which Señor Aguinaldo had previously taken in regard to it. Señor Aguinaldo, in order to avoid all scandal, did everything possible to avoid appearing in court, answering the summons of Artacho, who, realizing that his conduct had made himself hated by all Filipinos, agreed in a friendly arrangement to withdraw his suit, receiving in exchange \$5,000; in this way were frustrated the intrigues of the solicitor of the Dominican order and of the Spanish consul, who endeavored at any cost to destroy the \$400,000 by dividing it up.

Artacho is now on trial before a judicial court on charges preferred by various revolutionists for offenses which can be proved; he has no influence in the revolutionary party. (Extract from "The Story of the Philippines," by Murat Halstead, pages 66-67.)

But what do you think of Admiral Dewey, and General Anderson, and General MacArthur? Did Dewey bring over to his aid a

perjured scoundrel, who had sold his soul like Judas and his country like Arnold, form an alliance with him, ask his cooperation and advice, deliver over Spanish preservers to him, and commit our sick to his tender mercy?

The United States of America does not use traitors and scoundrels for its tools in the great transactions of its history.

The English General Buller repelled indignantly some attacks in the British press upon the character of the Boers, and said indignantly that it became a brave people to honor a brave enemy. I think the American people can do that. They will yet do justice to the martyrs of liberty in this oriental isle. What generous American, what youth who has been stirred by the story of Thermopylae and Marathon, what patriot who remembers Warren, what man with English blood who remembers Hampden, or Sydney, or Russell, what Dutchman who remembers Egmont and Horn, what Irishman who remembers Emmet, what Hungarian who remembers Kossuth will not feel his heart throb and his eyes moisten as he thinks of the lofty heroism and the awful tragedy of José Rizal, or as he reads the death chant which he wrote in his last hours, just before he was shot by the Spanish tyrants on the 30th of December, 1896. Our English translation gives only imperfectly the effect of the noble Spanish, the tongue in which the great scholar said he should choose to speak to his God.

Farewell, adored Fatherland; our Eden lost, farewell;  
Farewell, O sun's loved region, pearl of the eastern sea;  
Gladly I die for thy dear sake; yea, thou knowest well  
Were my sad life more radiant far than mortal tongue could tell,  
Yet would I give it gladly, joyously for thee.

Pray for those who died alone, betrayed in wretchedness;  
For those who suffered for thy sake torments and misery;  
For broken hearts of mothers, who weep in bitterness;  
For widows, tortured captives, orphans in deep distress;  
And pray for thy dear self, that thou may'st finally be free.

Farewell, adored country; I leave my all with thee,  
Beloved Philippines, whose soil my feet have trod.  
I leave with thee my life's love deep; I go where all are free;  
I go where are no tortures, where the oppressor's power shall be  
Destroyed, where faith kills not, where he who reigns is God.

**AGUINALDO REPRESENTED WHOLE PEOPLE.**

One of the great mistakes of many honest people is the belief that Aguinaldo has in some way imposed himself upon the people of Luzon and the neighboring islands against their will; that he is an unscrupulous usurper, who forced his authority on an unwilling people. This notion is corrected a hundred times by the testimony of our officials. Aguinaldo was as much the recognized leader of his people as Kossuth was the recognized leader of the Hungarians. Admiral Dewey brought him back from exile because he was the accepted choice of his people. There were 30,000 men in arms who hailed him on his arrival as their chosen leader. The constitution he promulgated was accepted by the people who were then, throughout Luzon and the Visayas, in the enjoyment of a quiet and orderly government, republican in form, save the brief and temporary dictatorship exercised only for military purposes—a dictatorship not half as absolute in theory as the dictatorship of our President over those islands has been in theory during the last twelve months. Of course, the authority of the government of Luzon and the adjacent islands did not extend over the savage tribes in the southern islands, or over the Sultan of Sulu. But at least it paid no tribute to that sultan.

General MacArthur, talking to H. Irving Hancock, Manila correspondent of the Criterion, said, what I have once quoted:

When I first started in against these rebels, I believed that Aguinaldo's troops represented only a faction. I did not like to believe that the whole population on Luzon—the native population, that is—was opposed to us and our offers of aid and good government. But after having come this far, after having occupied several towns and cities in succession, and having been brought much into contact with both insurrectos and amigos, I have been reluctantly compelled to believe that the Filipino masses are loyal and devoted to Aguinaldo and the government which he heads.

General Otis's proclamation of January 4, 1899, recognizes that the insurgents under Aguinaldo fairly represent the people. I will not recite it at length. But there is one very significant paragraph therein. It is this:

From the tenure and substance of the proclamation of the President, I am fully of the opinion that it is the intention of the United States Government, while directing the forces generally, to appoint the representative men now forming the controlling element of the Filipinos to civil positions of trust and responsibility.

Is that not a full acknowledgment, as of January 4, 1899, in the first place, that Aguinaldo and those associated with him were the controlling element of the Philippine Islands; and next, that they were fit for civil positions of trust and responsibility?

There is another admission in that proclamation, filtered and emasculated as it was. It is a part of the President's own language. "It should be the earnest and paramount aim of the Administration to win the confidence and respect and affection of the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands by insuring to them in every possible way the full measure of individual rights and liberty, which is the heritage of a free people."

It is true, is it not then, that the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands are entitled to that liberty which is the heritage of a free people? If it be true, then our imperialistic friends must answer another question—whether that liberty, which is the heritage of a free people, is consistent with the domination of any other people determining for them what shall be their institutions, laws, form of government, and policies, foreign and domestic.

Mr. President, there is one mode by which the people of the Philippine Islands could establish the truth of the charges as to their degradation and incapacity for self-government which have been made by the advocates of imperialism in this debate; and that mode was by submitting tamely and without resistance to the dominion of the United States.

WE ASKED COOPERATION, TREATED THEM AS ALLIES, AND ASSURED THEM OF INDEPENDENCE.

Aguinaldo came back to Luzon. He found 30,000 men in arms for liberty waiting to receive him. He conquered. They were poorly armed at first, but they got arms from us and they purchased arms abroad. They banished Spain from the whole of Luzon and the Visayas; they captured thousands upon thousands of Spanish prisoners; other thousands were committed to them by us, until they had the whole of the civilized portion of those islands under their command, and hemmed Spain into the city of Manila by a line of intrenchments extending from water to water. But for what they did the army of Spain could have withdrawn itself from the neighborhood of our fleet, and could have held its own against our military forces very likely to this moment.

Now, Mr. President, during all this time, down to the breaking

out of hostilities on the 5th of February, 1899, the forces of the people of whom Aguinaldo was the head held that entire territory as securely, as exclusively, as the American people held Massachusetts throughout the Revolutionary war after the evacuation of Boston on the 5th day of March, 1776.

They organized a civil government. It is true Aguinaldo was declared in the beginning dictator chief, as in three instances in South America Bolivar was declared dictator. That happens in all revolutions. While the conflict of arms is going on, but simultaneously with the dictatorship, Aguinaldo declared his purpose to surrender it as soon as peace and order could be restored and liberty achieved, and as fast as that happened, peaceful and orderly local government took the place of military power.

Now, Mr. President, there is no historic fact more clearly established by historic testimony than the facts—

First, That these people were aiming at independence from the beginning.

Second, That they achieved independence.

Third, That our commanders, naval and military, our Secretary of War, our Administration at home, knew all the time that they were aiming, striving, at independence.

Fourth, That we encouraged them by every form of practical assurance.

I am not speaking now of the assurance they derived from our Constitution, our Declaration of Independence, our known principles, our past history—I am speaking of what they had the right to take and understand as assurances that their independence was to be respected. Why, Aguinaldo proclaimed it a dozen times. He announced a free constitution, an independent constitution, and established it all over the islands of Luzon and the Visayas, and these documents were immediately communicated to our commanders, and were by our commanders at once reported to Washington.

During that whole time, down to the end of December, 1898, when General Miller unwittingly, contrary to General Otis's desire, made public the order of the President, not a word of opposition or of contradiction came from American lips to them. If ever silence gave consent, if ever actions spoke louder than words, if ever conduct bound a nation, aye, if ever conduct bound a man of honor, the people of the United States are bound to respect the independence these people had achieved.

But silence and knowledge of the fact on our part were not all. We formed an alliance with Aguinaldo; our General wrote to him official letters asking his cooperation. Admiral Dewey denies, with some indignation, that he said the things which Aguinaldo relies on as forming an alliance, but the military commanders do not deny it; they confess it; they reported it to the Department of War and to the President. Twice did the commanding generals representing the United States give express assurance to that effect by their own confession.

General Anderson, who commanded in the Philippines before Merritt and Otis, says in his article in the North American Review for February, 1900:

Whether Admiral Dewey, Consuls Pratt, Wildman, and Williams did or did not give Aguinaldo assurances that the Philippine government would be recognized, the Filipinos certainly thought so, probably inferring this from their acts rather than their statements.

Every American citizen who came in contact with Filipinos at the inception

of the Spanish war, or at any time within a few months after hostilities began, probably told those he may have talked with on the subject that we intended to free them from Spanish oppression. And here came in a natural misconception and misunderstanding. The general expression was, "We intend to whip the Spaniards and set you free." But this to Aguinaldo and his immediate followers had a very different meaning. To them it meant that the United States would recognize any government he and his followers might set up. It must be remembered that two years before Aguinaldo had been the leader in a rebellion the object of which was to set up an independent government. The Filipino people, in a vague way, had the same anticipation, for it must be understood that Aguinaldo is to his countrymen an ideal—an Oriental Washington—destined to be free from Spanish rule. Even if Dewey and the consuls had no right to pledge the Government, if they did so even without authority, it gives the insurgent leaders a certain equitable claim to consideration.

Now, what does the commander of the American forces tell you? He tells you that Aguinaldo inquired of Admiral Dewey if he authorized the promise made in his name by the captain of the *Petrel* and the two consuls, and that he received satisfactory assurances. He then goes on to say:

Receiving satisfactory assurances, he proceeded naively to say that the junta in Hongkong even then suspected that after whipping the Spaniards we would refuse them independence. The Admiral replied, assuring him that we were honorable and, having plenty of land, desired no colonies.

General Anderson adds:

Aguinaldo is mistaken in attributing this remark to the Admiral. I must plead guilty to this Delphic utterance at a subsequent interview.

General Anderson adds (North American Review, page 277):

"A few days thereafter he made an official call on me and \* \* \* asked if we, the North Americans, as he called us, intended to hold the Philippines as dependencies. I said I could not answer that, but that in one hundred years we had established no colonies. He then made this remarkable statement: 'I have studied attentively the Constitution of the United States and I find in it no authority for colonies, and I have no fear.'

"It may seem that my answer was somewhat evasive, but I was at the time trying to contract with the Filipinos for horses, carts, fuel, and forage."

General Anderson says that when he was commander in chief of our land forces Admiral Dewey thought he could not prudently fight such vessels as the *Pelayo*, and other formidable ships, which were then expected through the Suez Canal, in the close waters of the bay, where they would have the support of the heavy Krupp guns on land, and proposed that General Anderson should reembark the soldiers we had landed at Cavite and take them to Subig Bay. He adds:

"At that time the insurgent Filipinos had driven the Spanish soldiers within the defenses of Manila, and had them completely invested on the land side by light field works, which they held with about 14,000 men. They were poorly armed and equipped, yet, as they had defeated the Spaniards in a number of fights in the field and had taken 4,000 prisoners, it may be asserted in the vernacular of the camp that 'they had the morale on them.'"

The Manila garrison was so demoralized at that time, and so incomplete was their line of defense, that I believe it would have been possible, by coming to an understanding with Aguinaldo, to have carried their advance works by storm and to have captured all of the city, except the walled city or the old Spanish town. Under existing orders, we could not have struck a bargain with the Filipinos, as our Government did not recognize the authority of Aguinaldo as constituting a *de facto* government; and if Manila had been taken with his cooperation, it would have been his capture as much as ours. We could not have held so large a city with so small a force, and it would therefore have been practically under Filipino control.

On the 1st of July, 1898, I called on Aguinaldo with Admiral Dewey. He asked me at once whether "the United States of the North" either had recognized or would recognize his government. I am not quite sure as to the form of the question, whether it was "had" or "would." In either form it was embarrassing. My orders were, in substance, to effect a landing, establish a base, not to go beyond the zone of naval cooperation, to consult Admiral Dewey, and to wait for Merritt. Aguinaldo had proclaimed his government only a few days before (June 28), and Admiral Dewey had no instructions as to that assumption. The facts as to the situation at that time I believe to be these: Consul Williams states in one of his letters to the State Department that several thousand Tagals were in open insurrection before our declaration of war with Spain. I do not know as to the number, yet I believe the statement has foundation in fact. Whether Admiral Dewey and Consuls Pratt, Wildman, and Williams did or did not give Aguinaldo assurances that a Filipino government would be recognized, the Filipinos cer-

tainly thought so, probably inferring this from their acts rather than from their statements. If an incipient rebellion was already in progress, what could be inferred from the fact that Aguinaldo and thirteen other banished Tagals were brought down on a naval vessel and landed in Cavite? Admiral Dewey gave them arms and ammunition, as I did subsequently at his request. They were permitted to gather up a lot of arms which the Spaniards had thrown into the bay, and, with the 4,000 rifles taken from the Spanish prisoners, and 2,000 purchased in Hongkong, they proceeded to organize three brigades and also to arm a small steamer they had captured. I was the first to tell Admiral Dewey that there was any disposition on the part of the American people to hold the Philippines, if they were captured. The current of opinion was setting that way when the first expeditionary force left San Francisco, but this the Admiral had no reason to surmise. But to return to our interview with Aguinaldo.

I told him I was acting only in a military capacity; that I had no authority to recognize his government; that we had come to whip the Spaniards, and that if we were successful, the indirect effect would be to free them from Spanish tyranny. I added that, as we were fighting a common enemy, I hoped we could get along amicably together. He did not seem pleased with this answer. The fact is, he hoped and expected to take Manila with Admiral Dewey's assistance, and he was bitterly disappointed when our soldiers landed at Cavite. In a few hours after our interview, two of my staff officers, Major Cloman and Lieutenant Clark, who were walking through the streets of the town, were arrested and taken before Aguinaldo. They were told by him that strangers could only visit the town by his permission, but that in their case he was pleased to give them permission to proceed.

We at once landed our forces, and on the 4th of July Aguinaldo was invited to witness a parade and review in honor of our national holiday. He did not come, because he was invited not as President but as General Aguinaldo. This led me to write him a letter, stating that, while we hoped to have amicable relations with him, I would have to take Cavite as a base of operations, and closing with this sentence:

"I have, therefore, the honor to ask your excellency to instruct your officials not to interfere with my officers in the performance of their duties, and not to assume that officers or men can not visit Cavite without your permission."

A few days thereafter he made an official call, coming with cabinet and staff and a band of music. On that occasion he handed me an elaborate schedule for an autonomous government which he had received from some Filipinos in Manila, with a statement that they had reason to believe that Spain would grant them such a form of government. With this was an open letter addressed to the Filipino people from Pedro Alexandre Peterno, advising them to put their trust in Spain rather than America.

The day before two German officers had called on Aguinaldo, and I believe they had brought him these papers. I asked him if the scheme was agreeable to him. He did not answer, but ask if we, the North Americans, as he called us, intended to hold the Philippines as dependencies. I said I could not answer that, but that he could trust the honor of the United States; in one hundred and twenty years we had established no colonies. He then made this remarkable statement:

"I have studied attentively the Constitution of the United States, and I find in it no authority for colonies, and I have no fear."

It may seem strange that my answer was somewhat evasive, but I was at the time trying to contract with the Filipinos for horses, carts, fuel, and forage. \* \* \*

About the middle of July the insurgent leaders in Cavite invited a number of our army and navy officers to a banquet. There was some postprandial speechmaking, the substance of the Filipino talk being that they wished to be annexed, but not conquered. One of our officers, in reply, assured them that we had come not to make them slaves, but to make them freemen. A singular scene followed. All the Filipinos rose to their feet, and Buencamino, taking his wine-glass in his hand, said: "We wish to be baptized in that sentiment." Then he and the rest poured the wine from their glasses over their heads.

The origin of our controversies and conflicts with the Filipinos can, as already explained, be traced back to our refusal to recognize the political authority of Aguinaldo. Our first serious break with them arose from our refusal to let them cooperate with us. \* \* \*

The Filipinos had made every preparation to assail the Spanish lines in their front. Certainly they would not have given up part of their line to us unless they thought they were to fight with us. They therefore received General Merritt's interdict with anger and indignation. They considered the war as their war, and Manila as their capital, and Luzon as their country. \* \* \*

The situation was exceedingly critical. Our soldiers believed that the Filipinos were almost beside themselves with rage and disappointment. The friendly relations we had with Generals Recati and Morial alone prevented a conflict then and there. \* \* \*

I received an order from General Merritt to remove the Filipinos from the city. Had we attempted to use force, we would have had to fight to carry out our

orders. In that event we would certainly have had a serious complication. With 10,000 men we would have had to guard 18,300 Spanish prisoners and fight 14,000 Filipinos. I therefore took the responsibility of telegraphing Aguinaldo requesting him to withdraw his troops, and intimating that serious consequences would follow if he did not do so. I received his answer saying that a commission would come to me the next morning with full powers. Accordingly the next day Señores Buenaventura, Laga de, Araneta, and Sandecco came to division headquarters in Manila and stated that they were authorized to order the withdrawal of their troops if we would promise to reinstate them in their present positions on our making peace with Spain. Thereupon I took them over to General Merritt.

Upon their repeating their demands, he told them he could not give such a pledge, but that they could rely on the honor of the American people. The General then read to them the proclamation he intended to issue to the Filipino people. The commission then went back to Aguinaldo for further instructions. A member of the commission brought me a letter from Aguinaldo complaining that he had been harshly treated, and that his army had given up a part of their lines to us on the understanding that there was to be a cooperation between us in the future in military movements. General Merritt directed me to reply that if Aguinaldo had been apparently harshly treated it was from a military necessity, and that, while we might recognize the justice of their insurrection, it was thought judicious to have only one army in Manila at one time.

#### WAS LUZON A CONQUERED COUNTRY?

We held Manila and Cavite. The rest of the island was held not by the Spaniards, but by the Filipinos. On the other islands the Spaniards were confined to two or three fortified towns. At the time referred to we could not claim to hold by purchase, for we had not then received Spain's quitclaim deed to the archipelago.

Now, mark, this is the commander in chief of the American forces, and he tells you that although Dewey did not make that promise, he did. Here were these people in arms. They were in arms for independence. They had established government all over Luzon and the Visayas; all over the civilized and Christian portions of the Philippine Islands; their army was 30,000 strong, and constantly increasing. They were a people of two or three millions, at least. They were hemming in Spain into a single city; they had a constitution, a civil constitution, a republic, and we knew it; and then Aguinaldo says to the American commander, "Our friends in Hongkong are getting uneasy lest you intend not to leave us independent." And the reply is, "You can trust the honor of the United States; we have had no colonies for a hundred and twenty years." And the leader of that free people answers, "I have no fear; I have read your Constitution, and there is no provision for holding colonies in it."

Why, Mr. President, the Republican party in great States of this Union have been excited to indignation within a few weeks because General Miles had told the people of Porto Rico they should have the immunities of American citizens. "Immunities" is rather a vague and uncertain word, but if the assurance of General Miles given to a people who had done nothing for themselves, of immunities, sets the constituents of my friends from Vermont, and my friends from Indiana, my friends from Iowa, into a fever of alarm lest the faith of the United States be broken, what are we to say to a statement, when we were asked if we intended to interfere with their independence, "You can trust the honor of the United States; we have had no colonies for a hundred and twenty years?"

Now, we must of course accept Admiral Dewey's disclaimer. But Dewey and Anderson called on Aguinaldo together, and Aguinaldo afterwards called on Anderson by himself. It is of little consequence which said it, or if it be of any consequence which said it, the assurance of the commander of our troops on

land was more important under the circumstances than the same thing would have been coming from the Admiral. "Admiral Dewey did not say it, but I did," says the General. "I wanted to buy articles of the Filipinos." Yes, and he wanted a good deal more than that.

The Spaniards were hemmed in and kept in by the Filipinos. If Aguinaldo had withdrawn his forces, or if he had made terms with Spain, a very different and a very difficult task would have been that of the commandant of the American forces.

If there ever were a pledge of honor accepted and acted upon, and a consideration given, binding a great and noble people by the strongest tie that can bind a great and noble people—its national honor—that pledge was given that day.

But this is not all. I shall allude in a moment to the conduct of our commanders, establishing an alliance with the forces of the Philippine republic, commanded by Aguinaldo all through that year. Our attitude was maintained down to the end of December, 1898, when General Otis made this statement in a proclamation addressed to the people of the Philippine Islands, suppressing President McKinley's proclamation:

General Otis says:

It is also my belief that it is the intention of the United States Government to draw from the Filipino people so much of the military force of the islands as is possible and consistent with a free and well-constituted government of the country. \* \* \* I am also convinced that it is the intention of the United States Government to seek the establishment of a most liberal government for the islands, in which the people themselves shall have as full representation as the maintenance of law and order will permit, and which shall be susceptible of development, on lines of increased representation and the bestowal of increased powers, into a government as free and independent as is enjoyed by the most favored provinces in the world.

That is what you told those men through your military commander six weeks before the hostilities broke out.

There is the promise. In another statement he says:

I will assure the people of the Philippine Islands the full measure of individual rights and liberties, which is the heritage of a free people.

Now, what does that mean? What does that mean, Mr. President? My honorable friend says we must hold on to those islands forever; that he is a dastard who does not think so. And yet General Otis, whom the honorable Senator as I have no doubt justly eulogized, as the representative of the honor and the justice of the people of the United States, uttered that promise. Did he utter that promise to a people of slaves, half Spaniards and half savages in character? Did he utter that promise to a people incapable of self-government? He sent home his dispatch, and he has been in command there ever since till just now.

The President says he did not authorize that proclamation but he approved it.

Here, then, Mr. President, is the constant proclamation from the beginning that independence is the object of the Philippine people, known all along to the commanders and the Government of the United States.

Here is an independence actually achieved.

Here is a free, orderly, constitutional government, under which two or three million people are living, with schools, churches, universities, a congress, an administration, and an army.

Here is the oppressor driven out of every foot of his own land except one city, and penned up in that.

Here are two distinct, separate assurances from our military commanders that it is not the purpose of the United States to meddle or interfere with that people.

Here is the accepting and acting upon that assurance in one instance, the first time it was given, early in July, 1898.

Here is the benefit obtained by the United States:

The Spanish army kept within our grasp and within the fire of our guns, instead of escaping to the interior.

But that is not all. We recognized that independence in many ways. We made an alliance with Aguinaldo and his people; the facts were reported to our Administration at home, and the alliance never disclaimed.

Now, be it remembered that during all this time President McKinley disclaimed any title to any part of the Philippine Islands except Manila. He declared more than once, in language which is familiar, that we, the United States, have claimed no title to any part of the islands except the town.

We got no title, pretense of title, or claim of title to an inch of the territory beyond the city of Manila and its defenses, until the ratification of the treaty on the 10th day of May, 1899.

Now, if we had no title, who had? Will any man stand up in this Senate, in the American Senate, in the closing year of the nineteenth century, and declare that a rightful title to that territory was still in Spain? The man who would declare that, had better go to Spain to live. He has drawn in no Americanism with his mother's milk.

The whole correspondence in that period is a correspondence between allies. It discloses that they are fighting for independence on their side and we disclose no purpose to interfere with it on ours. On the 4th of July, 1898, General Anderson writes to Aguinaldo:

I have the honor to inform you that the United States of America, whose land forces I have the honor to command in this vicinity, being at war with the Kingdom of Spain have entire sympathy and most friendly sentiments for the native people of the Philippine Islands.

For these reason I desire to have the most amicable relations with you and to have you and your people cooperate with us in military operations against the Spanish forces.

In doing this I do not wish to interfere with your residence here and the exercise by yourself and other native citizens of all functions and privileges not inconsistent with military rule.

That was, it seems to me, a communication by the commanding general of the purpose of the United States not to interfere with the civil functions of the Philippine Government, except so far as was necessary for the conduct of military operations at Cavite.

On the 6th of July, 1898, General Anderson addresses Aguinaldo by his title of commanding general, and says:

I should like to have your excellency's advice and cooperation, as you are best acquainted with the resources of this country. It must be apparent to you that we do not intend to remain here inactive but to move promptly against our common enemy. I am solicitous to avoid any conflict of authority which might result from having two sets of military officers exercising command at the same place. I am also anxious to avoid sickness, by taking sanitary precautions. Your sanitary medical officers have been making voluntary inspections with mine, and fear epidemic disease if the vicinity is not made clean. Would it not be well to have prisoners work to this end under the advice of the surgeon?

I again renew my assurance of distinguished consideration.

July 6, 1898 (page 5), General Anderson replies to Aguinaldo

(again addressing him "Señor Don Emilio Aguinaldo, Commanding Philippine Forces"), and says:

I am encouraged by the friendly sentiments expressed by your excellency . . . to endeavor to come to a definite understanding, which I hope will be advantageous to both.

Very soon we expect a very large addition to our forces, and it must be apparent to you as a military officer that we will require much more room to camp our soldiers, and also store room for our supplies. For this I would like to have your excellency's advice and cooperation, as you are best acquainted with the resources of the country.

He also says that the medical officers of the two commands have been making voluntary inspections together, and asks whether it would not be well to have the prisoners work to make the vicinity clean, under the advice of the surgeons.

July 9, 1898, General Anderson reports (page 6) to the Adjutant-General of the United States Army, Washington, D. C.:

General Aguinaldo tells me he has about 15,000 fighting men, but only 11,000 armed with guns, which mostly were taken from the Spaniards. He claims to have in all 4,000 prisoners. When we first landed he seemed very suspicious and not at all friendly, but I have now come to a better understanding with him, and he is much more friendly and seems willing to cooperate. But he has declared himself dictator and president and is trying to take Manila without our assistance. This is not probable, but if he can effect his purpose he will, I apprehend, antagonize any attempt on our part to establish a provisional government.

July 14, 1898, General Anderson requests Aguinaldo that he give his (Anderson's) officers all possible assistance in making reconnaissance to the lines and approaches, and that Aguinaldo favor them with his advice (page 6). He adds: "Officers coming from me will have a note to that effect."

July 18, 1898 (page 8), General Anderson reports to the Adjutant-General, U. S. Army:

Since reading the President's instructions to General Merritt, I think I should state to you that the establishment of a provisional government on our part will probably bring us in conflict with the insurgents, now in active hostility to Spain.

July 19, 1898 (page 8), General Anderson writes to Aguinaldo, saying that Maj. J. F. Bell, U. S. A., has been sent by Gen. Wesley Merritt, U. S. A., to collect for him by the time of his personal arrival certain information concerning the strength and positions of the enemy and concerning the topography of the country surrounding Manila. He adds:

I would be obliged if you would permit him to see your maps and place at his disposal any information you have upon the above subjects, and also give him a letter or pass addressed to your subordinates which will authorize them to furnish him any information they can on these subjects and to facilitate his passage along the lines upon a reconnaissance around Manila.

July 19, 1898 (page 9), General Anderson writes to Aguinaldo: Your offer of assistance is appreciated and your assurances of good will are most gratifying.

July 22, 1898 (page 9), General Anderson writes to Aguinaldo: I observe that your excellency has announced yourself as a dictator and proclaimed martial law. As I am here simply in a military capacity I have no authority to recognize this assumption. I have no orders from my government on the subject; and, so far as I can ascertain, your independent status has not been recognized by any foreign power. Happy as I am to see you fighting so bravely and successfully against a common enemy, I can not, without orders, recognize your civil authority.

General Anderson writes to Aguinaldo on the 23d of July, 1898:

Señor Don EMILIO AGUINALDO,  
*Commanding Philippine Forces.*

GENERAL: When I came here three weeks ago, I requested your excellency to give what assistance you could to procure means of transportation for the Ameri

can Army, as it was to fight in the cause of your people. So far I have received no response. As you represent your people, I now have the honor to make requisition on you for 500 horses, 50 oxen and ox carts. If you can not secure these, I will have to pass you and make requisition directly on the people.

Now put that letter, dated the 23d of July, 1898, addressed to Señor Don Emilio Aguinaldo, commanding Philippine forces (and there are plenty similar communications), with Admiral Dewey's own to our Government that the people want independence. Who would doubt that a people unskilled in diplomatic forms, or would doubt that a people most skilled in diplomatic forms, would rightfully understand that the United States knew that Aguinaldo was the representative of his people, and, second, that they were then fighting for their independence?

July 24, 1898 (page 10), Aguinaldo replies to General Anderson:

I came from Hongkong to prevent my countrymen from making common cause with the Spanish against the North Americans, pledging before my word to Admiral Dewey to not give place (to allow) to any internal discord, because (being) a judge of their desires, I had the strong convictions that I would succeed in both objects, establishing a government according to their desires.

Thus it is that in the beginning I proclaimed the dictatorship, and afterwards, when some of the provinces had been liberated themselves from Spanish domination, I established a revolutionary government that to-day exists, giving it a democratic and popular character as far as the abnormal circumstances of war permitted. \* \* \*

It is true that my government has not been acknowledged by any of the foreign powers, but we expected that the great North American nation, which struggled first for its independence, and afterwards for the abolition of slavery, and is now actually struggling for the independence of Cuba, would look upon it with greater benevolence than any other nation.

He then expresses his indebtedness for our generosity and cautions General Anderson against disembarking our troops in places conquered by the Filipinos from the Spanish, without previous notice to his government, because as yet no formal agreement exists between the two nations, and the Philippine people might consider the occupation of its territories by North American troops as a violation of its rights.

On October 27, 1898, General Otis writes to Aguinaldo in regard to the establishment of a convalescent camp. He says:

General EMILIO AGUINALDO,  
*Commanding Revolutionary Forces, Malolos, Philippine Islands.*

GENERAL: \* \* \* I knew that you would not offer objections if it could be so placed as not to give your people annoyance, since it could not be in any wise a menace, but, on the contrary, would place our sick within your power and to a certain extent under your protection. \* \* \* I am fully convinced of your wish to maintain harmonious relations with the United States forces and government of Manila.

Aguinaldo writes a little later:

I can answer for my people, because they have given me evident proofs of their absolute confidence in my government, but I can not answer for that which another nation whose friendship is not well guaranteed might inspire in it [the people]; and it is certain that I do this not as a menace, but as a further proof of the true and sincere friendship which I have always professed for the North American people, in the complete security that it will find itself completely identified with our cause of liberty.

July 21, 1898 (page 12), General Anderson reports to the Adjutant-General of the United States Army:

Since I wrote last Aguinaldo has put in operation an elaborate system of military government, under his assumed authority as dictator, and has prohibited any supplies being given us except by his order. As to this last, I have written to him that our requisitions on the country for horses, ox carts, fuel, and bamboo (to make scaling ladders) must be filled, and that he must aid in having them filled.

His assumption of civil authority I have ignored, and let him know verbally that I could and would not recognize it, while I did not recognize him as a military leader.

I suppose the word "not" is a misprint  
He adds:

It may seem strange that I have made no formal protest against his proclamation as dictator, his declaration of martial law, and publication and execution of a despotic form of government. I wrote such a protest, but did not publish it, at Admiral Dewey's request, and also for fear of wounding the susceptibilities of Major-General Merritt, but I have let it be known in every other way that we do not recognize the dictatorship.

These people only respect force and firmness. I submit, with all deference, that we have heretofore underrated the natives. They are not ignorant, savage tribes, but have a civilization of their own; and, although insignificant in appearance, are fierce fighters, and for a tropical people they are industrious.

August 5, 1898, General Anderson reports to the adjutant-general, Department of the Pacific, etc.:

I have the honor to inform you that General Aguinaldo, through a staff officer, complains that the Signal Corps, United States Army, in putting up wires has interrupted his communications; that he was promised that this interruption would not last more than one day, but that it has now been out of working order for three days; that he is very glad to have the army use his telegraph poles, but it is so important to keep his communication that he earnestly requests prompt action in the matter.

August 10, 1898 (page 14), General Merritt issues instructions to General Babcock to ask insurgent generals or Aguinaldo for permission to occupy their trenches, but if refused not to use force.

July 30, 1898 (page 15), General Anderson reports to the adjutant-general, Department of the Pacific, etc., referring to instructions in relation to an issue of rations to Spanish prisoners:

I made verbal answer that if their prisoners were kept here they would have to be well fed, but that he could, of course, remove them if he saw fit to do so.

August 1, 1898 (page 15), Aguinaldo writes to Consul Williams:

I am fully persuaded that the Filipinos will arrive at the height of happiness and glory if in future they can show with raised heads the rights which to-day are shown by the free citizens of North America. These islands will be in effect one of the richest and pleasantest countries of the globe if the capital and industry of North Americans come to develop the soil.

Answering Consul Williams's suggestion that this might be accomplished without annexation to the United States, he says (pages 16, 17):

But I do not believe these unworthy suspicions. I have full confidence in the generosity and philanthropy which shine in characters of gold in the history of the privileged people of the United States, and for that reason, invoking the friendship which you profess for me and the love which you have for my people, I pray you earnestly, as also the distinguished generals who represent your country in these islands, that you entreat the Government at Washington to recognize the revolutionary government of the Filipinos, and I, for my part, will labor with all my power with my people that the United States shall not repeat the sentiments of humanity in coming to the aid of an oppressed people.

Say to the Government at Washington that the Filipino people abominate slavery; that in the midst of their past misfortunes they have learned to love liberty, order, justice, and civil life, and that they are not able to lay aside their own wishes when their future lot and history are under discussion. Say also that I and my leaders know what we owe to our unfortunate country; that we know how to admire and are ready to imitate the disinterestedness, the abnegation, and the patriotism of the grand men of America, among whom stands pre-eminent the immortal General Washington.

You and I both love the Filipinos; both see their progress, their prosperity, and their greatness. For this we should avoid any conflict which would be fatal to the interests of both people, who should always be brothers. In this you will acquire a name in the history of humanity and an ineradicable affection in the hearts of the Filipino people. (From General Aguinaldo to Mr. Williams, United States consul.)

On pages 19 and 20 are memoranda of notes to General Anderson, which it is said were drawn up and submitted to General Anderson by the commissioners of Aguinaldo. It contains this article:

10. We are pleased, lastly, to be certain (affirm) that our own commissions and petitions do not signify acknowledgment on our part of North American sovereignty in these islands any more (or longer) than the necessity of actual war (demands).

General Merritt replies, August 20, 1898 (page 20):

As most of them (memoranda) seem to be reasonable, it gives him much pleasure to say that he agrees to the following.

And then he assents to several of them in terms. He does not express any objection to the others.

In reply to a further communication of Aguinaldo, dated August 21 (page 21, etc.), General Merritt directs Major Bell to make certain communications, the third of which is as follows (page 22):

(3) That I have every disposition to represent liberally the Government at Washington, which I know is inclined to deal fairly with him and his people; but not knowing what the policy of that Government will be, I am not prepared to make any promises, except that in the event of the United States withdrawing from these islands care will be taken to leave him in *as good condition as he was found by the forces of the Government*.

Major Bell, in a note of explanation (page 23), says:

Their lack of definiteness and my unwillingness to comment upon the language seemed to arouse their suspicions and apprehensions.

August 27, 1898 (page 25), Aguinaldo addresses General Merritt and reminds him:—

\* \* \* That without the long siege sustained by my force you might have obtained possession of the ruins of the city, but never the rendition of the Spanish forces, who could have retired to the interior towns.

September 8, 1898 (page 28), General Otis, in command and the military governor in the Philippines, addresses Aguinaldo a letter in which he claims no authority except over Manila. Then urging him to a certain course of conduct, says (page 29):

By the able representatives who have charge of the interests of the Philippine revolutionary forces this conclusion will be admitted to be incontrovertible, and argument on the point is unnecessary. Can they who seek civil and religious liberty, and invite the approval and assistance of the civilized world, afford to enter upon a course of action which the law of nations must condemn?

Also:

It is well known that they have made personal sacrifices, endured great hardships, and have rendered aid. But it is forgotten that my Government has swept the Spanish navy from the seas of both hemispheres, sent back to Spain the Spanish army and navy forces recently embarked for your destruction and for the secure holding of its Philippine possessions; that since May 1 last its Navy has held the city of Manila at its mercy, but out of considerations of humanity refused to bombard it, preferring to send troops to demand surrender and thereby preserve the lives and property of its inhabitants! Is it forgotten that the destruction of the Spanish navy and the retention of Spanish armed men in its European possessions has opened up to you the ports of the island of Luzon and held Spain helpless to meet its refractory subjects?

It was undertaken by the United States for humanity's sake, and not for their aggrandizement or for any national profit they expected to receive, and they have expended millions of treasure and hundreds of the lives of their citizens in the interest of Spanish suffering colonists.

In a communication October 14, 1898 (page 36), General Otis writes to Aguinaldo, speaks of the necessity of establishing a convalescent camp, and says:

Should the emergency become imminent, the dictates of humanity and the overwhelming demands of my Government would oblige me to establish a convalescent camp in this locality, to which troops could be sent for recuperation, and to

relieve the congested situation which must attend the presence of so large a body of armed men within a thickly populated city. I have in mind for this possible camp the grounds on the shore of the bay formerly occupied by United States troops and designated Camp Dewey, or the high ground to the east of the city. It is my desire to place it at a locality which would not inconvenience any organizations connected with your forces or the surrounding inhabitants, and to the emergency of this anticipated proceeding I respectfully invite your consideration and ask your assistance should execution become necessary. Should action of this character be decided upon, I beg of you to rest firmly in my unqualified assurances that it will be undertaken in a spirit of the greatest friendliness and with the sincere desire to neither compromise nor affect in the slightest degree your interests and those of the people whom you represent, but, on the contrary, to enhance them.

Permit me to subscribe myself, General, with the highest respect,  
Your most obedient servant,

E. S. OTIS,  
Major-General, U. S. V.,  
United States Military Governor in the Philippines.

October 27, 1898 (page 39), General Otis writes to Aguinaldo conceding that he is right in his interpretation of General Merritt's requirements fixing the lines for the occupation of the two forces. This is exceedingly important as showing that the place where the hostilities broke out was within the Filipino territory and not in ours. He further expresses the opinion that all difficulties have arisen from a misunderstanding, and assures Aguinaldo of his confidence in the sincerity of his desire to maintain harmonious relations.

November 2, 1898 (page 41), General Otis, addressing Aguinaldo by his title of Gen. Emilio Aguinaldo, commanding Philippine revolutionary forces, calls attention to—

the erroneous impressions which publicly prevail regarding the humane sentiments and good intentions cherished by the Filipinos, and which are so damaging to them in securing a position as a people which they seek to invoke. You will please pardon me for this allusion; but the matter is so important to the best interests of the Filipinos, that I have taken the liberty, uninvited, to present it.

Confident that you seek the welfare of your people, may I in that confidence ask you to use your conceded influence to correct this condition of affairs and to act with me in efforts to place these prisoners in a position which will put an end to the scrimonious critics which now so widely prevail?

This means—if it mean anything—the advice of our commanding general to the commander of the Philippine forces so to act as to promote the desire of his people for independence.

November 3, 1898 (page 42), Aguinaldo replies, stating the reasons for treating the Spanish priests as prisoners, being for special reasons applicable to them alone, and claiming also that ordinary international law will have to give way before the just cause of a country of millions of souls, because this cause is one of humanity.

To this General Otis replies, November 10, 1898 (page 44):

I am unable to comprehend the force of your remark to the effect that international law must give way before the just cause of a country of millions of souls because it is one of humanity. I fail to understand how the principles of that law can be antagonistic in any particular to the welfare of a people, founded, as they are, on the best interpretation of the law of nature which the acknowledged wisdom of ages of human progress has been able to bestow. Every independent nation claiming advanced enlightenment professes to be bound by these obligations of that law and certainly would be held responsible by the civilized world should it openly violate them.

I do not think that the views you advance would receive favorable general acceptance, and believe therefore, in all sincerity, that the good name, reputation, and welfare of that people would be greatly enhanced by relieving those men from the captivity which they have so long endured.

I can only ask in conclusion that the wishes of my Government may receive more favorable consideration than your most friendly letter indicates.

Aguinaldo replies November 18, 1898 (pages 46 et seq.), discussing the question of international law with General Otis, and says:

The principles of international law sustained by the most noted authors were taken into account by me when I treated as prisoners of war civil employees and the priests. Jiore, Martens, Bluntschli, and others hold that all persons, though not forming a part of the army, but who follow it to perform their pacific functions, can be held as prisoners of war. I only exempt the hospital personnel, according to the Geneva convention, provided that they take no active part in the war.

In virtue of the right of retort, during the war of North American independence, the great Washington, to avenge the shooting of an American colonel, a prisoner in the hands of the English, deemed beyond the rules of war the English Colonel Argyll, a prisoner held by the Americans. Thanks to the intervention of the Queen of France, the order was not executed. In virtue of the same right, the German generals in the war of 1870 ordered the houses in which their soldiers had been treacherously attacked to be fired and destroyed.

He adds a statement of the aspiration of the Filipino people who aspire to a life of liberty and independence. To say the least, this most able argument, said to have been prepared by Aguinaldo's attorney-general, is worthy of any jurist anywhere, and at least compares well in ability with those of any commander who has taken our side in the discussion.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE] puts this question to Commander Bradford:

I would like to ask just one question in that line. Suppose the United States, in the progress of that war, found the leader of the present Philippine rebellion an exile from his country in Hongkong, and sent for him and brought him to the islands in an American ship, and then furnished him 4,000 or 5,000 stands of arms, and allowed him to purchase as many more stands of arms in Hongkong, and accepted his aid in conquering Luzon, what kind of a nation, in the eyes of the world, we would appear to be to surrender Aguinaldo and his insurgents to Spain?

Commander Bradford answers:

We become responsible for everything he has done. He is our ally and we are bound to protect him.

The question was worthy of a manly heart, and no manly heart, as it seems to me, could answer it but one way: "We would as soon think of restoring a redeemed soul to Satan as to think of restoring the Filipinos to Spain." Then I should have expected from what I knew of that honorable Senator, another question, which perhaps may before these proceedings are over be put to him:

Suppose the United States in the progress of that war found the leader and president of the Filipino rebellion an exile from his country in Hongkong, and sent for him and brought him to the islands in an American ship, and then furnished him with 4,000 or 5,000 stands of arms, and allowed him to purchase as many more, and accepted his aid in conquering Manila, what kind of a nation, in the eyes of the world, should we appear to be to turn upon him and plunder him of the independence we had helped him to gain? What sort of a nation would we appear, in the eyes of the world to be, when we had accepted that aid, and he had conquered the entire country but one city, we knowing at the time that he and his people were striving for independence; what kind of a country should we appear to be to wrest from him that independence, to put his people under our feet, to declare that we never would let them go, whether they were fit for self-government or not, that we were there to get all we could, and to hold all we could get, and that if we had our way they should never have independence to the end of time? I wish my honorable friend from Maine had put that question also. For

myself I make to it the same answer: I would as soon restore a redeemed soul to Satan as to plunder that people of the liberty for which they have fought.

Now, Mr. President, if instead of a great international transaction, this had been a case of a contract between two citizens, to be enforced in any court; if one had rendered valuable aid, or delivered valuable property, which had been accepted by the other with the declaration that a certain compensation was expected; if Aguinaldo had worked on a farm, or had helped draw a load, under such circumstances, is there a court in the civilized world—on the face of the earth—that would not have declared that silence and the failure clearly and distinctly to reject the condition, and to reject assistance, was of itself equal to an affirmative acceptance? Does not the silence of a great nation give consent as well as the silence of common men? "The people expect independence," said Admiral Dewey to the Secretary of the Navy and to the President, and no instruction was given to undeceive them.

THEY DESIRED INDEPENDENCE AND A REPUBLIC.

We knew they were fighting for independence.

June 12, 1898, Dewey sends three proclamations issued by General Aguinaldo, dated May 24, to the Secretary of the Navy.

These documents disclosed to our commanders in the East and to our Administration at home that the Philippine people were in arms for independence, and their confidence that the American people desired to aid them in the accomplishment of that holy aspiration. The receipt of such a communication was an assent, and can not be interpreted otherwise by honorable men or honorable nations.

My Beloved Fellow-Countrymen:

I accepted the treaty proposed by Don Pedro H. Paterno, agreeing with the captain-general of these islands under certain conditions, and laying down arms and dismissing the forces under my immediate control, because I believed it better for the country than to carry on the insurrection, for which resources were lacking; but since the failure to fulfill any of the said conditions certain bands were dissatisfied and remained under arms, and since a period of five months has elapsed without any step toward the reforms which we demand to advance our country to the rank of a civilized nation, like our neighbor Japan, which in a little more than twenty years has advanced to a satisfactory position, and demonstrated her power and vigor in the late war with China, while the Spanish Government remains powerless to contend with certain obstacles which constantly arrest the progress of our country with a deadly influence, which has been a principal factor in causing the uprising of the people, now that the great and powerful North American nation has come to offer disinterested protection for the effort to secure the liberation of this country, I return to assume command of all the forces for the attainment of our lofty aspirations, establishing a dictatorial government, which will set forth decrees under my sole responsibility, assisted by the advice of eminent persons, until these islands are completely conquered and able to form a constitutional convention and to elect a president and a cabinet, in whose favor I will duly resign the authority.

Given at Cavite the 24th of May, 1898.

Filipinos:

This dictatorial government proposes to begin within a few days our military operations, and being informed that the Spaniard intends to send us a parliamentary commission in order to open negotiations for restoring Spanish authority, and being resolved to admit no negotiations of that sort in view of the collapse of a former treaty by default of the same Spanish Government, and noting, moreover, the presence in this place of certain persons coming in the capacity of spies for the said Spanish Government, as general-in-chief of this region I decree as follows:

ARTICLE I. Civilians or soldiers who enter this territory with authority to negotiate, but without presenting themselves under a flag of truce as provided for such cases by international law, and also those lacking credentials and documents for their due recognition of character and personality, shall be considered guilty of serving as spies and put to death.

ARTICLE II. Any Filipino who unduly takes the aforesaid service shall be con-

sidered as a traitor to his country, and there shall be imposed upon him the penalty of hanging by the neck in a public place for the period of two hours, with a label attached bearing the statement that he is a traitor to his country.

ARTICLE III. Any soldier or civilian found within our territories seeking to pass over to the enemy bearing secrets of war or plans of fortifications shall also be reckoned as a traitor and put to death.

Given in Cavite the 24th of May, 1898.

On the 10th of June, 1898, Aguinaldo addressed from Cavite to the "President of the Republic of the Great North American Nation" an eloquent but impassioned appeal. It was called out by a story in the London Times that it was the purpose of the United States to sell the Philippine Islands to Great Britain, or some other European power. Aguinaldo declares his belief that the story is a vile slander. He is then at Cavite, from which he dates his letter. He informs the President that he has organized a government there "by the consent of the Admiral of your triumphant fleet," and says his forces are then besieging Manila on the south and east, and have already captured the whole garrison of the province of Cavite, as well as that of the adjoining province of Bataan, together with the governors and officials of both provinces. He protests against the statement of the London Times, "in the name of this people, which trusts blindly in you not to abandon it to the tyranny of Spain, but to leave it free and independent, even if you make peace with Spain." He concludes thus: "I offer fervent prayers for the ever-increasing prosperity of your powerful nation, to which and to you I shall show unbounded gratitude, and shall repay you with interest that great obligation."

Now, here is an official declaration. Mark the date. It is June 10, 1898; when the insurgents had conquered the adjoining islands, with the governors and officials, and were holding Manila on the land side while the American forces alone held it by sea. Aguinaldo declares his profound affection, and that of his people, for the United States, and tells President McKinley that they are trusting him to leave them free and independent, even if we make peace with Spain. This is no question of a consul. It is not a question of a commanding general. It is not a question of an admiral. This leader of his people, in his own name and words, addresses the President of the United States and informs him of their faith—their blind faith—that the American nation will leave him and his people free and independent; will leave them exactly what the American people had declared of the Cubans when they had much less control of their own territory than the Filipinos had of theirs—that they are and of right ought to be. Our fathers of the Declaration of Independence spoke for three million; Aguinaldo spoke for eight. We declared they were what the Senate declared Cuba of right ought to be. Then the Cuban army was almost under the feet of Spain. Then every one of her capital towns, and every one of her ports, and every one of her strongholds was in Spanish hands.

Mr. E. Spencer Pratt, consul-general at Singapore, telegraphs the Department May 5, 1898, inclosing the Singapore Free Press of the day before, containing a report of the departure of Aguinaldo to join Commodore Dewey, and says that the facts are, *in the main*, correctly given. In that statement is the following sentence:

General Aguinaldo's policy embraces the independence of the Philippines, whose internal affairs would be controlled under European and American advisers. American protection would be desirable temporarily, on the same lines as that which might be instituted hereafter in Cuba.

Now, Mr. President, this is a pretty significant fact, fortified as it is with so many like statements covering the entire period before Aguinaldo reached Manila, perhaps before he reached Hongkong. The Government at Washington knew that he went there to put himself at the head of the Philippine forces for the purpose of achieving their independence. They knew it from an official communication, which declares that the main facts of that article are correct. And knowing it, they accepted his aid; they furnished him with arms; they dealt with him as a general; they asked for his cooperation; they permitted him to wrest from the Spaniards every spot of that territory but the city of Manila, and they never undeceived him.

What court, what public opinion, what honest man, what man of honor, what gentleman would fail to keep, letter and spirit, the promise implied by such a transaction in any circumstances in life? One of our commissioners at Paris asked Mr. Foreman, when he was testifying, if it were not true if the Spaniards failed to act up to the lofty spirit of the Psalmist—of promising to their own hurt, and changing not.

I should have liked to ask that honorable commissioner what he thought they would say of us if we accepted the assistance of these Filipinos, with the full knowledge that they were asking for their independence, and then coolly appropriated the proceeds of their devotion and valor to our own advantage.

Gen. Charles A. Whittier said before the commission, "All the success was on the native side, and yet the Spaniards surrendered between 7,000 and 8,000 men, well armed, plenty of ammunition, and in good physical condition." (Page 499, Document 62.)

General Whittier adds, "Aguinaldo's troops control all the settled part of the island (except Manila), as well as much of the southern country." \* \* \* "Their conduct to their Spanish prisoners has been deserving of the praise of all the world. I have heard of no instance of torture, murder, or brutality since we have been in the country." (Page 500.)

"Every place had been taken from them by the Filipinos, who managed their advances and occupation of the country in an able manner." (Page 501.)

#### THEY HAD ACHIEVED INDEPENDENCE.

Now, there is nothing more clearly proved in the whole history of these transactions than that the desire of the Filipinos for independence, both soldiers and people, was fully known during the whole of the year 1898 and down to the time of the breaking out of hostilities—to the President, to the Secretary of State, to our consuls, to Admiral Dewey, to General Otis, and down to a time long after the capture of Manila they knew that there was an unsuspecting confidence on the part of that people that the United States had no desire to interfere with their liberty or their independence. They accepted their aid. They cooperated with them in military movements. They asked favors of them. They requested them to change their military positions for the convenience of our forces. They handed over to them prisoners of war by the thousands. They asked their advice. They gave our sick in hospitals over to their care. They made requests on them for military supplies. And not a word or a thought conveyed to them that they had any expectation but to cooperate with them against a common enemy, as an independent and as an equal ally. Whether the word ally was used—and of course

no man questions the denial of Admiral Dewey—the substance of an alliance existed, and the substance of the thing was conveyed by the United States to the Philippine nation in a hundred ways.

General Otis says, speaking of the early part of August, 1898:

Outwardly peace reigned, but the insurgents, disappointed because not permitted to enjoy the spoils of war in accordance with mediæval customs, and to exercise with the United States authorities joint control of municipal affairs, were not friendly disposed, and endeavored to obtain their asserted rights and privileges through controversies and negotiations and a stubborn holding of the positions taken by their troops.—*Otis Report*, page 4.

A communication took place between Aguinaldo and General Merritt. A letter was addressed to Merritt, August 27, 1898, describing the line to which he would retire, and stating some conditions which he said he was compelled to insist upon.—*Otis Report*, page 5.

Otis answers, August 31, that General Merritt has been unexpectedly ordered away, and that he must have a little time to acquaint himself with the conditions.—*Otis Report*, page 6.

September 8, 1898. General Otis addressed Aguinaldo by the title "The Commanding General of the Philippine Forces."

He says:

I note with pleasure your allusion to your very friendly disposition toward my Government, as manifested by your prompt attendance to our request for a supply of water. \* \* \* I do not forget that the revolutionary forces under your command have made many sacrifices in the interests of civil liberty and for the welfare of your people.

And adds that as Manila had been surrendered to the United States by Spain—

by, all the laws of war and of all international precedents, United States authority over Manila and its defenses is full and supreme.—*Otis Report*, page 7.

He goes on:

But conceding \* \* \* that they [the forces under General Aguinaldo's command] have made great personal sacrifices, endured great hardships, and have rendered aid, my Government has swept the Spanish navy from the seas of both hemispheres, \* \* \* and that since May 1 last its Navy has held the city of Manila at its mercy, but out of consideration of humanity refused to bombard it. \* \* \* Is it forgotten that the destruction of the Spanish navy and the retention of Spanish armed men in its European possession has opened up to you the ports of the island of Luzon and held Spain helpless to meet its refractory subjects.—*Otis Report*, page 7.

He adds that the war—

was undertaken by the United States for humanity's sake, and not for any aggrandizement or for any national profit it expected to receive.—*Otis Report*, page 7.

Otis then demands that Aguinaldo withdraw his troops beyond the line of the city's defenses before Thursday, the 15th instant, and says that if he shall decline he shall be obliged to resort to forcible action.—*Otis Report*, page 9.

Aguinaldo asked him to withdraw his threat to use force, as he was fearful that he would be unable to remove his troops upon a demand.—*Otis Report*, page 9.

Otis then, at Aguinaldo's request, furnishes him with a simple request to withdraw, which he might show his troops in order that they might not infer that they were withdrawing under a threat; and adds an expression of his confidence in the ability and patriotism of Aguinaldo. "The withdrawal was effected adroitly, as the insurgents marched out in excellent spirits, cheering the American troops."—*Otis Report*, page 10.

Speaking of the same period, General Otis says:

The insurrection had spread to and was active in all the islands with the exception of the Zulu Archipelago. \* \* \* Vessels flying the Spanish flag could not safely enter any ports which had been seized by the insurgents.—*Otis Report*, page 14.

The insurgents, whose government had taken firm root at Malolos, were, through the medium of president, cabinet, and congress, reeling off decrees and constitutional provisions at a rapid rate. Their army was continually successful against the small Spanish garrisons scattered throughout the islands, and they were beginning to acquire the belief that they were invincible. Revenue was their need and desire, and this they began to derive quite largely from imposing export duties on all products shipped to Manila.—*Otis Report*, page 15.

Aguinaldo's army of observation, on the outskirts of the city, contained many natives or residents of Manila.—*Otis Report*, page 15.

"The assertion was made and became current that certain suburbs were not within the jurisdiction of Manila." He adds: "The best opinion did not consider the suburbs, still occupied by the insurgent troops, beyond the city limits." But he afterward admits that he was mistaken and that the Filipinos were right in their claim.—*Otis Report*, page 15.

October 14, 1898, General Otis addresses a long communication to "Gen. Emilio Aguinaldo, commanding Philippine revolutionary forces, Malolos, P. I."

He says:

It was found impossible to determine definitely, on any existing map, either the limits of the city or the lines of its defenses.—*Otis Report*, pages 16-17.

He then asks Aguinaldo's assistance, if it shall become necessary, to establish a temporary convalescent camp on high ground to the east of the city, and adds:

Should action of this character become necessary, I beg of you to rest firmly in my unqualified assurances that it will be undertaken in a spirit of the greatest friendliness, and with the sincere desire to neither compromise nor affect in the slightest degree your interests and those of the people whom you represent, but, on the contrary, to enhance them.—*Otis Report*, page 18.

On October 20 it was reported that "insurgent troops were moving southward by railway from Malolos and other points and were being concentrated near the north line of the city," and speaks of it as a threatening demonstration.—*Otis Report*, page 19.

October 22 Aguinaldo writes to General Otis, calling his attention to the fact that "the town of Pandacan has always been considered outside of the old municipal limits of Manila."—*Otis Report*, page 19.

Afterwards, on October 27, Otis writes to Aguinaldo: "I have referred to General Merritt's letter of August 20, which you mention, and find that it is as you state." \* \* \* "Pandacan is certainly far within the line of defense, and \* \* \* have been led to believe that it has of late been considered one of the city's suburbs."—*Otis Report*, page 21.

Otis then asks Aguinaldo's consent to the establishment of a convalescent camp for the American soldiers.—*Otis Report*, page 21.

Aguinaldo replies, November 4, that such a camp must have American troops there to protect it, "unless it depends for security solely and exclusively upon the guaranty offered by the laws dictated by our government," and adds: "It is my duty to submit these conditions to the representatives of the people."—*Otis Report*, page 21.

This was followed by dispatches from Dewey from July 17, forwarding a proclamation and decree addressed to the people

and providing for the election by the people of public **officers**, the organization of courts, the taking of a census, a **tribunal of justice** and civil records, and one of revenues and property. **The decree begins by this declaration:**

To the People of the Philippines:

Act of Providence have placed me in a position for which I can not but recognize my natural inefficiency, but as I have no right to violate the laws of Providence, nor to decline the duties which honor and patriotism impose upon me, I greet you, my beloved people, from that position.

In the face of the whole world I have proclaimed that the aspiration of my whole life, the final object of all my wishes and efforts, is your independence, because I have the inner conviction that it is also your constant longing, since independence for us means the redemption from slavery and tyranny, the recovery of lost liberty, and the admission to the concert of civilized nations.

I understand, moreover, that the first duty of any government is to interpret faithfully the aspirations of the people. With this in view, although the abnormal circumstances of the war have compelled me to constitute this dictatorial government which assumes full civil and military power, my constant desire is to surround myself with the most prominent people from each province, who by their conduct deserve its confidence, so that, learning from them the true needs of each, I may be enabled to adopt the most efficacious means for filling such needs and curing deficiencies in accordance with the wishes of all.

The proclamation of June 28 recites the history of the connection with Spain, and of the conflict which has resulted in a separation. He says:

And now they no longer limit their claims to the assimilation with the political constitution of Spain, but ask for definite separation from her; they are fighting for their independence, firmly convinced that the time has come when they can and must govern themselves.

So they have constituted a revolutionary government, based upon wise and just laws, adapted to the abnormal conditions through which they are passing, and at the same time preparing them to become a republic. Taking reason as the only guide for their actions, justice as the only end, and honorable work as the only means, they call upon their Philippine sons, without distinction of class, to unite firmly together for the purpose of forming a society of nobility, not nobility of birth or pompous titles, but of work and personal merit of each one—a free society where there shall be no egotism and personal politics that crush and annihilate, no envy and favoritism that debase, no bragging and charlatany that make ridiculous.

And it could not be otherwise; a people which has given proofs of valor and long suffering in time of trouble and danger, and of industry and diligence in time of peace, is not intended for slavery; such a people is called to be great, to be one of the strongest arms of Providence to direct the destinies of humanity; such a people has sufficient resources and energy to free itself from the ruin and annihilation into which the Spanish Government has plunged it, and to claim a modest, but humble seat in the concert of free nations.

Given at Cavite, June 23, 1898.

The third proclamation (also of June 23, 1898) contains careful and wise provisions for a provisional government.

Mr. President, these are three of the greatest state papers in all history. If they were found in our own history of our own Revolutionary time, we should be proud to have them stand by the side of those great state papers which Chatham declared were equal to the masterpieces of antiquity. Admiral Dewey was well justified in saying that these people were far superior in their intelligence and more capable of self-government than the natives of Cuba, and that he was familiar with both races.

On July 22 Dewey telegraphs to the Secretary of the Navy: "The people expect independence."

On the 7th of August General Merritt and Admiral Dewey sent a joint notice to the Spanish general in chief that hostile operations would begin in forty-eight hours from the receipt of the notice, to which the governor-general replies:

Finding myself constantly surrounded by insurrectionary forces, I am without places of refuge for the increased numbers of wounded, sick, women and children who are now lodged within the walls.

**General Merritt and Admiral Dewey replied:**

We submit, without prejudice to the high sentiments of honor and duty which your excellency entertains, that surrounded on every side as you are by a constantly increasing force, with a powerful fleet in your front, and deprived of all prospect of reenforcement and assistance, a most useless sacrifice of life would result in the event of an attack.

Now, Mr. President, look for a moment at that correspondence. They held up to the Spanish commander as the compelling reason on which he must surrender that he is surrounded by the constantly increasing forces of Aguinaldo. They speak separately in another sentence of the powerful fleet in his front. But the letter of General Merritt and Admiral Dewey puts the necessity for surrender distinctly on the ground that the Spaniards are surrounded by the powerful and increasing forces of Aguinaldo.

Mr. President, that was in July. The American forces held Manila and Iloilo Bay only in the group. Two positions only in that group of twelve hundred islands, and the rest was held peaceably, quietly, and without dispute by the people thereof. The forces of Aguinaldo had complete authority and control of Luzon. They had established a constitution, a representative government; courts, schools, and public worship had resumed their ordinary course. They had fought for independence, which they had won. No act like those acts which unhappily accompany great wars, even among civilized people, has been laid to their charge; not even acts like those which were charged upon the contending parties during our own civil war. There is an occasional statement that Aguinaldo, or his comrades, desired to loot or to plunder the city of Manila; that they desired to inflict cruel vengeance upon the Spanish, and that they desired to perform this or that act of cruelty. As to the acts of Aguinaldo, all his declarations to his people contradict these charges.

On August 1 the Secretary of the Navy cables to Admiral Dewey: "Reported here that monks and other prisoners in the hands of the insurgents at Cavite are in danger of being unjustly put to death." But no confirmation of that report comes from Dewey.

On the 9th of August the Assistant Secretary of the Navy cables to Admiral Dewey:

At the instance of the French ambassador, information concerning treatment of Spanish prisoners by insurgents is requested.

To which Admiral Dewey replies:

Referring to your telegram of August 29, from my observation and that of my officers, the Spanish prisoners are not treated cruelly by the insurgents, but they are neglected, not from design, but owing to want of proper food supply, medical outfit, and attendance.

At this time Admiral Dewey thought a force of 5,000 men all that was necessary to reduce the islands to our complete control. At present 86 war vessels, 2,051 officers, and 63,483 men are found necessary.

I shall not speak just now of the President's proclamation, suppressed by General Otis because he feared that it would bring on instant hostilities, and the unexpected publication of that proclamation by General Miller, with its effect. But I wish to allude here to the President's instructions to General Merritt of May 28, 1898, as showing the absolute folly of the claim of those persons who speak of the Filipinos as savages, as niggers, as barbarians.

The President says (page 86, Doc. No. 208):

All churches and buildings devoted to religious worship and to the arts and sciences, all schoolhouses, are, so far as possible, to be protected, and all destruction or intentional defacement of such places, of historical monuments or archives, or of works of science or art, is prohibited.

That instruction was made to the Filipinos by General Merritt and proclaimed August 14, 1898 (page 87):

VI. All churches and places devoted to religious worship and to the arts and sciences, all educational institutions, libraries, scientific collections, museums, are, so far as possible, to be protected; and all destruction or intentional defacement of such places or property, of historical monuments, archives, or works of science and art, is prohibited, save when required by urgent military necessity. Severe punishment will be meted out for all violations of this regulation.

The custodian of all property of the character mentioned in this section will make prompt returns thereof to these headquarters, stating character and location, and embodying such recommendations as they may think proper for the full protection of the properties under their care and custody, that proper orders may issue enjoining the cooperation of both military and civil authorities in securing such protection.

On July 15, 1898 (page 90), Aguinaldo addressed Admiral Dewey as follows:

SIR: The revolution having taken possession of the various provinces of the archipelago, this government has found it necessary to adopt the form and organization best suited to the popular will. I have therefore the pleasure and honor of placing in your hand the inclosed decrees, which contain the organization referred to, begging that you will communicate to your Government that the desires of this government are to remain always in friendship with the great North American nation, to which we are under many obligations.

A decree announced to Admiral Dewey and doubtless at once communicated by him to the President contained the following (page 90):

*To the People of the Philippines:*

Acts of Providence have placed me in a position for which I can not but recognize my natural inefficiency, but as I have no right to violate the laws of Providence, nor to decline the duties which honor and patriotism impose upon me, I greet you, my beloved people, from that position.

In the face of the whole world I have proclaimed that the aspiration of my whole life, the final object of all my wishes and efforts, is your independence, because I have the inner conviction that it is also your constant longing, since independence for us means the redemption from slavery and tyranny, the recovery of lost liberty, and the admission to the concert of civilized nations.

This decree goes on to say (page 91), June 18, 1898:

I understand, moreover, the urgent necessity of establishing in each town a solid and substantial organization, a stronger bulwark of public security, and the only means for insuring the union and discipline which are indispensable for the establishment of a republic—that is, the government of the people by the people—and for settling international conflicts which may arise.

He then goes on to make a decree to establish a local self-government, prescribing as a condition that any inhabitant qualified shall be entitled to be elected, provided always that he is a friend of the Philippine independence.

In Aguinaldo's proclamation of June 23, 1898, establishing the revolutionary government, he says (page 95):

ARTICLE I. The dictatorial government will be entitled hereafter the revolutionary government, whose object is to struggle for the independence of the Philippines until all nations, including the Spanish, shall expressly recognize it, and to prepare the country so that a true republic may be established.

On the 6th of August, 1898 (page 99), Aguinaldo issued a proclamation to foreign governments, in which he says:

*To Foreign Governments:*

The revolutionary government of the Philippines on its establishment explained through the message dated the 23d of June last the true causes of the Philippine revolution, showing according to the evidence that this popular movement is the result of the laws which regulate the life of a people which aspire to progress and to perfection by the sole road of liberty.

The said revolution now rules in the provinces of Cavite, Batangas, Mindoro, Tayabas, Laguna, Morong, Bulacan, Bataan, Pampanga, Nueva Ecija, Tarlac, Pangasinan, Union, Infanta, and Zambales, and it holds besieged the capital of Manila.

In these provinces complete order and perfect tranquillity reign, administered by the authorities elected by the provinces in accordance with the organic decrees dated 18th and 23d of June last.

The revolution holds moreover about 9,000 prisoners of war, who are treated in accordance with the customs of war between civilized nations and humane sentiments, and at the end of the war it has more than 30,000 combatants organized in the form of a regular army.

In this situation the chiefs of the towns comprised in the above-mentioned provinces, interpreting the sentiments which animate those who have elected them, have proclaimed the independence of the Philippines, petitioning the revolutionary government that it will entreat and obtain from foreign governments recognition of its belligerency and its independence in the firm belief that the Philippine people have already arrived at that state in which they can and ought to govern themselves.

Accompanying this is an account of a meeting of representatives of the various towns, setting forth in an admirable manner the evidences of civilization and aspiration for freedom and their fitness for self-government:

The discussion took place with the prudence and at the length which so important a question demands, and after suitable deliberation the following declarations were unanimously adopted:

The Philippine revolution records, on the one hand, brilliant feats of arms, realized with singular courage by an improvised army almost without arms, and, on the other, the no less notable fact that the people after the combat have not entered upon great excesses nor pursued the enemy further, but have treated him, on the contrary, with generosity and humanity, returning at once to their ordinary and tranquil life.

Such deeds demonstrate in an undisputable manner that the Philippine people was not created, as all believed, for the sole purpose of dragging the chains of servitude, but that it has a perfect idea of order and justice, shuns a savage life, and loves a civilized life.

But what is most surprising in this people is that it goes on giving proofs that it knows how to frame laws commensurate with the progress of the age, to respect them and obey them, demonstrating that its national customs are not repugnant to this progress; that it is not ambitious for power, nor honors, nor riches, aside from the rational and just aspirations for a free and independent life and inspired by the most lofty idea of patriotism and national honor; and that in the service of this idea and for the realization of that aspiration it has not hesitated in the sacrifice of life and fortune.

Filipinos are fully convinced that if individuals have need of material, moral, and intellectual perfection in order to contribute to the welfare of their fellows, peoples require to have fullness of life; they need liberty and independence in order to contribute to the indefinite progress of mankind. It has struggled and will struggle with decision and constancy, without ever turning back or retrograding before the obstacles which may arise in its path, and with unshakable faith that it will obtain justice and fulfill the laws of Providence.

In virtue of the foregoing considerations the undersigned, giving voice to the unanimous aspirations of the people whom they represent and performing the offices received from them and the duties pertaining to the powers with which they are invested—

Proclaim solemnly, in the face of the whole world, the independence of the Philippines;

This document also contains the Philippine constitution (page 107), beginning—

We, the representatives of the Philippine people, lawfully invoked, in order to establish justice, provide for common defense, promote general welfare, and insure the benefits of freedom, imploring the aid of the Sovereign Legislator of the Universe in order to attain these purposes, have voted, decreed, and sanctioned the following—

#### POLITICAL CONSTITUTION.

##### FIRST TITLE.

##### THE REPUBLIC.

**ARTICLE 1.** The political association of all the Filipinos constitutes a nation, the estate of which is denominated Philippine Republic.

**ART. 2.** The Philippine Republic is free and independent.

**ART. 3.** Sovereignty resides exclusively in the people.

**ART. 4.** The government of the republic is popular, representative, alternative, and responsible, and is exercised by three distinct powers, which are denominated legislative, executive, and judicial. Two or more of these powers shall never be vested in one person or corporation; neither shall the legislature be vested in one individual alone.

**THIRD TITLE.**

**RELIGION.**

**ART. 5.** The state recognizes the equality of all religious worships and the separation of the church and the state.

The constitution contains the usual safeguards for freedom found in the constitutions of our American States.

The reports of Admiral Dewey and of General Otis and the officers under his command are ample to show that the people of the Philippine Islands were a brave and intelligent people, struggling for independence, for which they were fit, under competent and able leadership, actuated by a like spirit. They were striving for an independent republic—bravely, intelligently, and, but for us, successfully.

May 15, 1898, this appears clearly enough from the dispatches of Dewey, although in the beginning he undervalued the strength of the people of the Philippine Islands.

May 18, 1898, he telegraphs:

I can take Manila at any moment. To retain possession and thus control the Philippine Islands would require, in my best judgment, a well-equipped force of 5,000 men. Spanish force is estimated at 10,000 men. The rebels are reported 30,000 men.

May 24, he telegraphs:

Aguinaldo, the rebel commander in chief, was brought down by the *McCulloch*. Organizing forces near Cavite and may render assistance that will be valuable.

It will be seen that the rebels who accepted Aguinaldo as their leader were 30,000 strong before he came to them. How idle, then, in the face of that single fact, to suggest that he was imposing an unwilling domination upon that people.

May 27 Dewey telegraphs:

It is impossible for the people of Manila to buy provisions except rice.

Of course, this was due to the investment by the rebel forces. And he adds:

Steamer has just arrived from Amoy with 3,000 Mauser rifles and a great amount of ammunition for Aguinaldo, whose force is increasing constantly.

May 30 Dewey telegraphs:

Aguinaldo, revolutionary leader, visited the *Olympia* yesterday. He expects to make a general attack on May 31. Doubt ability to succeed.

June 6 Dewey telegraphs:

Insurgents have been engaged actively within the province of Cavite during the last week. They have won several small victories, taking prisoners about 1,800 men, 50 officers; Spanish troops, not native.

June 27 Dewey telegraphs:

Aguinaldo, insurgent leader, with 18 of his staff, arrived May 19, by permission, on *Nanshan*. Established self Cavite, outside arsenal, under the protection of our guns, and organized his army. I have had several conversations with him, generally of a personal nature. Consistently I have refrained from assisting him in any way with the force under my command, and on several occasions I have declined requests that I should do so, telling him the squadron could not act until the arrival of the United States troops. At the same time I have given him to understand that I consider insurgents as friends, being opposed to a common enemy. He has gone to attend a meeting of insurgent leaders for the purpose of forming a civil government. Aguinaldo has acted independently of the squadron, but has kept me advised of his progress, which has been wonderful. I have allowed to pass by water recruits, arms, and ammunition, and to take such Spanish arms and ammunition from the arsenal as he needed. Have advised frequently to conduct the war humanely, which he has done invariably. My relations with him are cordial, but I am not in his confidence. The United States

has not been bound in any way to assist insurgents by any act or promises, and he is not, to my knowledge, committed to assist us. I believe he expects to capture Manila without my assistance, but doubt ability, they not yet having many guns. In my opinion these people are far superior in their intelligence and more capable of self-government than the natives of Cuba, and I am familiar with both races.

Leonard R. Sargent, with the permission of Admiral Dewey, spent the greater part of the months of October and November, 1898, in company with Paymaster Wilcox, in the interior and northern part of the island of Luzon. They traveled more than six hundred miles. Their report is highly commended by Admiral Dewey, who speaks of "the success of their undertaking, their thoroughness of observation, and the ability shown in their report." The gentleman's observations appear in two articles published in the "Outlook," September 1st and 21st, respectively, 1899.

The original report is now before me, and bears this indorsement signed by Admiral Dewey:

Approved and respectfully forwarded for the information of the Navy Department.

Especial attention is invited to this interesting and carefully prepared report, which, in my opinion, contains the most complete and reliable information obtainable in regard to the present state of the northern part of Luzon Island.

GEORGE DEWEY,

*Rear-Admiral, U. S. Navy, Commanding Asiatic Station.*

The report furnished evidence of the quiet and order maintained all over the island by the Filipino authorities. There was some little hesitation at permitting the gentlemen to travel without a pass from Aguinaldo, who in his turn expected an application from the American commanders. But a personal letter was obtained from Consul-General Williams to Aguinaldo requesting that passports be provided. Aguinaldo put his refusal on the ground that there was an attempt to stir up an insurrection in the northern provinces, and that should that happen he might not be able to provide for their safety. But he assured them they were free to prosecute their journey, and that they would encounter no opposition from his forces.

Mr. Sargent says:

At that time the military forces of the United States held control only in Manila, with its environs, and in Cavite, and had no authority to proceed farther. In the meantime the native population, taking matters into their own hands, had declared their independence from all foreign jurisdiction and had set up a provisional government with Aguinaldo at its head. Although this government has never been recognized, \* \* \* it can not be denied that, in a region occupied by many millions of inhabitants, for nearly six months it stood alone between anarchy and order. It was the opinion at Manila during this period, and possibly in the United States, that their condition was something akin to anarchy.

But he adds,

We found the conditions to be much at variance with this opinion.

They visited seven provinces, of which some were under the immediate control of the central government at Malolos, while others were remotely situated and accessible only by lengthy and arduous travel. He says:

As a tribute to the efficiency of Aguinaldo's government and to the law-abiding character of his subjects, I offer the fact that Mr. Wilcox and I pursued our journey throughout in perfect security and returned to Manila with only the most pleasing recollections of the quiet and orderly life which we found the natives to be leading under their new régime. \* \* \* We traveled first across the province of Nueva Ecija, by far the poorest and least interesting of all the provinces we visited. And yet even here we were greatly surprised by the intelligence and refinement of the inhabitants. \* \* \* We were particularly struck by the dignified demeanor of our hosts and by the graceful manner in which they extended to us their welcome. We had unlimited opportunities for conversation with the

citizens of the towns, and we found everywhere a class that gave evidence of considerable culture and a certain amount of education. \* \* \* The Spanish language, Spanish history, church history, and the dead languages evidently formed its leading features. The natives of this class seemed to have made use of the opportunities offered them, and they had the subjects above mentioned completely at command. \* \* \*

Our route carried us through the valley of the Rio Grande Cagayan—probably the largest area of level country in Luzon Island. Its towns throughout give evidence of the labor that has been expended on them. Each town has an elaborate church and convent, usually built of brick. Our entertainment in the different towns varied according to the facilities at hand, but in all cases music was the leading feature. The towns of Ilagan and Aparri, with their wealthy and pleasure-loving population, provided a most elaborate entertainment. These towns are laid out in regular streets, and have many squares of substantial frame buildings. They have each population of between ten and fifteen thousand. We spent three days at Ilagan, and I think it was here that we were brought into closest touch with the Filipino character. The cultured class which I have spoken of before was strongly in evidence, and I think before leaving we had discussed views with nearly every member of it. They all realized that they were passing through a crucial period in the history of their people, and were eager to acquire all possible knowledge that might assist them to think clearly in this crisis. On the evening following our arrival a ball was given in our honor, which was attended by all the elite of the town. There were present about fifty young women and twice that number of men. All were dressed in European fashion. The girls were pleasant, and the men comported themselves in all respects like gentlemen. It was hard to realize that we were in the very heart of a country generally supposed to be given up to semi-savages.

During our stay at Ilagan we lived at the house of the mayor. This building was of great size, and was built of magnificent hard wood from the neighboring forest. The reception room was very large, with a finely polished floor. It contained a piano and set of excellent bamboo furniture, including the most comfortable chairs and divans imaginable. The Filipinos pride themselves on their cookery, and it is indeed excellent. There is no suspicion of the greasy and garlicky flavor that characterizes a Spanish meal. The shortest of three dinners given in our honor numbered fifteen courses, and seemed interminable. In addition to fish, rice, chickens, and other domestic products of the country, there was served game of many sorts, including doves, snipes, deer, mountain buffalo, and boar. It was astonishing how many of the dishes were "comida del pais," and must be sampled by the visitor to secure a just conception of the Filipino talent in matters of the palate. The Filipino's table is always set, at least when guests are present. He is very temperate in his use of liquor. I have never seen an intoxicated Filipino.

**Why, Mr. President, they seem to get along without the Maine law as well as the people of Maine get along with it.**

Vigan, the capital of South Ilocos, has a population of about 28,000, and Candon, farther to the southward, is not far behind this figure. The mayor of Candon was of the hustler type, and was evidently on the outlook for an opportunity to "boom" his town. On our departure he presented us with a written description of its exceptionally desirable location from a business standpoint. Every town gave evidence of the bitter fighting that had taken place between the natives and the Spaniards. The men whom we met in the western provinces possessed in general the same characteristics that we had observed in the countrymen farther to the eastward. \* \* \* Freedom of thought marked the views of every Filipino that I have heard express himself on the subject of religion. \* \* \* Throughout the island a thirst for knowledge is manifested, and an extravagant respect for those who possess it. I have seen a private native citizen in a town in the interior exercises a more powerful influence than all the native officials over the minds of the inhabitants, simply because he was known to have been educated in the best schools at Manila, and was regarded for that reason as a superior man. The heroes of these people are not heroes of war, but of science and invention. Without rival, the American who is best known by reputation in Luzon is Mr. Edison, and any native with the slightest pretension to education whom you may question on the subject will take delight in reciting a list of his achievements. The ruling Filipinos, during the existence of their provisional government, appreciated the necessity of providing public schools to be accessible to the poorest inhabitants.

**And then he adds:**

I have found the native of the interior of Luzon an astonishingly different character from the one ordinarily met in Manila.

In the second of these articles Mr. Sargent gives an astonishing

account of the awakening of the faculties of these people. He says:

We heard many tales, and were in a position to authenticate them to a great extent, of deeds that told in glowing terms of the endurance and courage the Filipinos could display when impelled by a sufficient motive. The revolution in Luzon Island was by no means a simultaneous uprising of the population, and in its early stages the force that opposed the Spanish power was not overwhelming in its numbers. In the provinces far in the interior particularly the earlier encounters found the advantage in the hands of the Spaniards, whose opponents were but small bands of the most daring and desperate natives of the vicinity, poorly armed, and entirely without organization or discipline.

Remember all along that this is indorsed by Admiral Dewey. He says:

Yet these pioneers of rebellion did win brilliant and surprising victories, and by their success encouraged their more timid neighbors to join their fortunes to the cause. \* \* \*

At the time of our journey the patriotic enthusiasm of the population was everywhere at its height. The boast of every inhabitant was the national army, whose organization was then being rapidly perfected. Commissions were eagerly sought by the young men of the higher class, and there were more volunteers for service in the ranks than could be armed or uniformed. It is universally asserted that every preparation should be made to defend the newly won independence of the island against all foreign aggression. The older Filipinos, especially those of wealth and influence, declared their desire to give every support in their power to the cause, and were as much a part of the warlike movement as those who actually took up arms.

This was before the negotiation of the treaty of peace, before the debate in the Senate, and before the date of the anti-imperialist leagues or political movements here.

That the civil power should be placed in the same hands was a dangerous experiment, but at the same time a necessary one. The first object of the Filipinos had been to win their independence; the next was to defend it. For both these purposes they had need of their best fighting material, and the selection was made accordingly. The result proved more fortunate than there had been reason to hope. While exercising absolute authority throughout the island and governing entirely by military law, the leaders of the army appeared, nevertheless, to endeavor to mete out justice to all classes alike.

They continued, moreover, to assert their intention to relinquish their temporary power when the establishment of a perfect peace should make such a step possible, and gave most encouraging proofs of the good faith with which they spoke.

On the whole, as far as I could judge, the tendency was upward. The young officers displayed an earnest desire to improve their minds for the benefit of the state, and seemed to be impelled by the ambition to prove themselves worthy of the trust that had been confided in them.

The report finds on several occasions Spanish prisoners—priests, soldiers, and civil officials. It says:

We have seen representatives of each of these three classes in these towns. We could detect no signs of previous ill treatment, nor of undue restriction. On the contrary, they appeared to possess the freedom of the town in which they lived.

Speaking of the smaller towns, they say:

They were well grounded on only three points—the destruction of the Spanish squadron in Manila harbor, the surrender of Manila, and the declaration of the Philippine government at Malolos of the independence of the islands, and the establishment of a republican form of government with Aguinaldo as president.

Balls were given in their honor. They were welcomed to the houses of the principal inhabitants, where they found very much such a reception, in the way of elegant hospitality, as they would have found in traveling in this country or anywhere in Europe.

Speaking of the provinces of Cagayan and Isabella, they say:

An idea of their wealth can be obtained from the fact that before the Philippine insurrection \$3,000,000 in tobacco alone came yearly from the one province of Isabella. Both provinces raise also sugar, rice, cocoa, and coffee. Cattle also are shipped. \* \* \*

At Aparsi we went alongside the *Philippina*, and reached the wharf by crossing this vessel. We were met on board by Commandante Leyba, military commander of the province of Cagayan. We were taken to a private house where we were quartered during our stay at Aparsi. Here we met Colonel Tirona, commander of the military district including the provinces of Nueva Vizcaya, Isabella, and Cagayan. He welcomed us cordially, and continued from that time to treat us in a very friendly manner. We remained at Aparsi three days, until the departure of the steamer *Oso*, November 9. (Par. 41.)

The steamer *Saturno*, which had left the harbor the day before our arrival, brought news from Hongkong papers that the Senators from the United States at the congress of Paris favored the independence of the islands, with an American protectorate. Colonel Tirona considered the information of sufficient reliability to justify him in regarding the Philippine independence as assured and warfare in the island at an end. For this reason he proceeded to relinquish the military command he held over the provinces, and to place this power in the hands of a civil officer elected by the people. On the day following our arrival in Aparsi, the ceremony occurred which solemnized this transfer of authority in the province of Cagayan. The presidents locales of all the towns in the province were present at the ceremony, conducted by a native priest. After the priest had retired, Colonel Tirona made a short speech, stating that, since in all probability permanent peace was at hand, it became his duty to relinquish the authority he had previously held over the province, and to place it in the hands of a civil officer elected by the people. He then handed the staff of office to the man who had been elected "jefe provincial." This officer also made a speech, in which he thanked the disciplined military forces and their colonel for the service they had rendered the province, and assured them that the work they had begun would be perpetuated by the people of the province, where every man, woman, and child stood ready to take up arms to defend their newly won liberty, and to resist with the last drop of their blood the attempt of any nation whatever to bring them back to their former state of dependence. His speech was very impassioned. He then knelt, placed his hand on an open Bible, and took the oath of office. He was followed by the three other officers who constitute the provincial government, the heads of the three departments—justice, police, and internal revenue. Every town in this province has this same organization. At the time of our departure, Colonel Tirona planned to go within a few days to Iligan, and from there to Bayombong, repeating this ceremony in the capital city of each province. (Par. 42.)

#### The report goes on to say:

There are no Spaniards here, with the exception of two or three merchants. One of these we have met. He is pursuing his business entirely unmolested. (Par. 43.)

The above statement about Spanish provinces is repeated in regard to some other provinces, and there is no exception to this condition of things throughout the entire island. They sum up their conclusions as follows:

#### 53. INTELLIGENCE AND EDUCATION OF THE NATIVES.

The Philippine officers, both military and civil, that we have met in all the provinces that we have visited have, with very few exceptions, been men of intelligent appearance and conversation. The same is true of all those men who form the upper class in each town. The education of most of them is limited, but they appear to seize every opportunity to improve it. They have great respect and admiration for learning. Very many of them desire to send their children to schools in the United States or Europe. Many men of importance in different towns have told us that the first use to be made of the revenue of their government, after there is no more danger of war, will be to start good schools in every village. The poorer classes are extremely ignorant on most subjects, but a large percentage of them can read and write.

#### 54. RELATION BETWEEN RICH AND POOR.

There is a very marked line between these two classes, and this has been broadened by the insurrection, for the reason that military officers must equip themselves without pay, and that civil officers have numerous expenses for which they receive no return. All officers, civil and military, have therefore been chosen from the richer class, and the political and military power of the provinces is in the hands of that class. The private soldiers are fed and clothed by the government and allowed a very small amount of spending money—in the western provinces 30 cents in silver per week.

#### 55. ATTITUDE OF THE MILITARY TOWARD THE CIVIL CLASS.

In the provinces of the east that we have visited there appears to be little or no friction between the civil and military classes. Officers and privates, as far as we could observe, treat civilians with consideration. In the provinces of Ilocos

Sur and Union there is a marked difference. The officers are more domineering. In traveling in these provinces we had many opportunities to observe this attitude. When accidents happened to our carriage, the officer commanding our escort called to our assistance every native within sight. When they did not answer his call promptly, we have seen him strike them with his riding whip. One man had a serious wound on his face, where an officer had struck him with his pistol butt. He came to us for redress, after having appealed in vain to the military officer in command of the town. An order from Don Emilio Aguinaldo, dated October 12, 1898, calls the attention of his officers to the evils of this practice, and orders them to correct it in themselves and to instruct all sergeants, corporals, and privates on the attitude they should maintain toward civilians.

#### 56. DOMINION OF THE CHURCH.

In the provinces of Nueva Ecija, Nueva Vizcaya, Isabella, and Cagayan the native priests have no voice whatever in civil matters. The Catholic church itself seems to have very little hold on the people of these provinces. Many men have expressed to us their preference for the Protestant church. In Ilocos Sur and Union there are many more priests than in the other provinces mentioned. Every pueblo and barrio has its cura, and there are higher officers of the church in the larger towns. They appear to have an important influence in all civil matters.

#### 57. POPULAR SENTIMENT REGARDING INDEPENDENCE.

Of the large number of officers, civil and military, and of leading town-people we have met, nearly every man has expressed in our presence his sentiment on this question. It is universally the same. They all declare they will accept nothing short of independence. They desire the protection of the United States at sea, but fear any interference on land. The question of the remuneration of our Government for the expense of establishing a protectorate is never touched upon. On the subject of independence there is again a marked difference between the four provinces first visited and those of Ilocos Sur and Union. In the former there is more enthusiasm, the sentiment is more of the people; in the latter it is more of the higher class and of the army. In these provinces we have seen signs of actual discontent with the existing state of things.

#### 58. ATTITUDE TOWARD THE UNITED STATES.

There is much variety of feeling among the Philippines with regard to the debt of gratitude they owe to the United States. In every town we found men that said that our nation had saved them from slavery, and others who claimed that without interference their independence would have been recognized before this time. On one point they are united, however, viz.: That whatever our Government may have done for them, it has not gained the right to annex them. They have been prejudiced against us by the Spaniards. The charges made have been so numerous and so severe that what the natives have since learned has not sufficed to disillusion them. With regard to the record of our policy toward a subject people, they have received remarkable information on two points—that we have mercilessly slain and finally exterminated the race of Indians that were native to our soil, and that we went to war in 1861 to suppress an insurrection of negro slaves, whom we also ended by exterminating. Intelligent and well-informed men have believed these charges. They were rehearsed to us in many towns in different provinces, beginning at Malolos. The Spanish version of our Indian problem is particularly well known.

#### 59. PREPAREDNESS FOR WAR.

The Philippine government has an organized military force in every province we have visited. They claim it extends also into Ilocos, Norte, Abra, Lepanto, Bontoc, and Benguet. With regard to its existence in Ilocos and Benguet we can speak with assurance.

It is said that 200,000 men, from all the islands, could be put into the field well armed. They were then distributing 40,000 rifles, and ammunition was plentiful. The rifles were principally Remingtons, but many were Mausers.

#### THEY WERE FIT FOR INDEPENDENCE.

They say Aguinaldo in the beginning established a dictatorship. So did we. The difference is he promised to abandon it when independence was achieved, accompanied it with a form of government, and the soldiers under his command were eager to give way to the civil power, even when there came what turned out to be a false rumor that independence was not to be interfered with by us.

We, on the other hand, steadfastly refused to promise anything for the future, and we refuse it now. The dictatorship for a short

time of the trusted and beloved leader of a nation fighting for freedom and the dictatorship forever of a foreign country talking about Chinese trade and mountains of coal and nuggets of gold are very different things.

It seems to me that the Filipino leaders and the Filipino people have shown themselves, under difficult and trying conditions, as fit for freedom and self-government as any people south of us on the American continent from the Rio Grande to Cape Horn. I believe if we had dealt with them as it seems to me we ought to have dealt with them, they would have established their nation in constitutional liberty much more rapidly than has been done by any Spanish-speaking people. Certainly they would have compared favorably with Haiti, with San Domingo, or even with Mexico in her early days. They devised an excellent constitution. They had a congress, they had courts, they had a president, they had a cabinet. Much less than this was declared by our imperialist friends sufficient to make Cuba a nation entitled to recognition. It is true they declared a dictatorship for their transition period, just as Bolivar did in the South American countries; just as Massachusetts did with her committee of safety during the first few years of the Revolutionary war. They had newspapers, schools, literature, statesmen. They have exhibited remarkable fighting qualities, considering the enormous superiority of the mighty antagonist with whom they had to deal. Major Younghusband, an English writer of great intelligence, sympathizing himself with the British view of human rights and the relations of powerful countries to weak ones, which our friends have imbibed of late days, says that their people were stirred to their last outbreak against Spain by the effect of a powerful novel, just as our people in the old anti-slavery days were moved by Uncle Tom's Cabin. They are Christians. In their houses and churches are found books, paintings, and other works of art. One pretty high authority—I do not think that is at all true, however—says that there was less illiteracy there than in the United States. But I have no doubt that there was less illiteracy there than in many parts of the United States, and in all parts of the continent south of the United States at a very recent period. The State papers which these people have issued show a high degree of intelligence. Their communications to our generals, whether oral or written, while they show something undoubtedly of the attitude of weakness dealing with strength, are, on the whole, highly creditable to their sagacity.

We have been furnished with the reports of the commissioners appointed by the President of the United States to investigate affairs in the Philippine Islands. They made a preliminary statement which came out by accident, not by design, just on the eve of last fall's election.

These preliminary statements fail to give us any facts as to the constitution framed by Aguinaldo and his companions; as to their own declarations of purpose in their proclamation; as to whether their authority was paramount and undisputed; whether they established good government and good order; whether they had courts or legislative assemblies, or schools, or churches. It is as if somebody should write the history of the American Revolution and the establishment of our Government without a word enabling you to ascertain whether the Americans were fit for self-government or independence; or whether France, our

ally, had a duty to subjugate us, as she tried afterward to subjugate Mexico, on the ground that other nations would if she did not; or had left out altogether any statement of our national and State constitutions, and the history of government in provinces like Massachusetts and New Hampshire, where the foot of the invader never touched the soil after they were driven out, in the early part of '76.

So whenever the character of persons are spoken of they are invariably styled the best men. I suppose that is the natural fashion of speech; that any Senator in speaking of the people of any town, or State, or neighborhood, would speak of the Republicans, or Democrats, or Populists, as the best people, according as he happened to belong to the one or the other political party.

There are many points of resemblance between Americans struggling for independence and the Filipinos. The commissioners say:

This movement was in no sense an attempt to win independence, but was merely an effort to obtain relief from abuses which were rapidly growing intolerable. The reforms demanded are set forth in a proclamation by one of the insurgent leaders.

The reforms demanded, and for which they were struggling, are not unlike those set forth in our address to the King, and our address to the people of England in 1774-5. They demanded that the lands held in mortmain by the church should be returned to the townships, or to the people, just as in the early history of England, when she was Catholic, the people passed the statutes against mortmain and limited the holding of lands by ecclesiastic authority.

Second, They demanded that "Spain should concede to the Filipinos parliamentary representation, freedom of the press, toleration of all religious sects, laws common with hers, and administrative and economic autonomy, trials in the neighborhood, equality before the law."

Why, that sounds like a passage from Bancroft's History.

"He has transported men beyond the seas," says the Declaration of Independence.

"Legal equality for all persons," "All men are created free and equal," says the Declaration of Independence. And even my friend from Connecticut thinks this is true of some of them.

The commissioners go on to say:

A powerful adjunct to the revolutionary movements was the Katipunan Society. This order was patterned on the Masonic order. It was a secret society and had about 400,000 members, who were in the main residents of the Tagalog provinces and of the valley of the Pasig River. In Manila and this valley there were 80,000 members.

I have heard somewhere that there was a similar prosperous organization in the United States in the early days, and that a commander in chief named George Washington clothed himself with its insignia and, I believe, laid the corner stone of a capitol somewhere.

I do not profess to know very much about that mighty order to which so many of the greatest men in America and throughout the world have been members, in high authority and in fullest communion, including some Presidents of the United States, but it strikes me that if in the city of Manila itself, in the single city, the only spot where these hostilities begun, with one or two trifling exceptions, held by the power of the United States, there

was an order of this character, with 80,000 members, devoted to independence, it is pretty good evidence that the best citizenship, after all, is on the side of the people. Do you not think it likely that the love of liberty and the love of independence burns brighter in the human soul in proportion as the man is better? That it does not blaze quite as clearly, quite as intensely, in the bosom of the ignorant and degraded savage as in the bosom where education, and religion, and honor, and refinement have their home? I suppose that every British gentleman, and every British commissioner would have gone back to England at any time during the war of our revolution and reported that the best men were on the side of Great Britain and that Washington was a scheming adventurer, having only the rabble for his associates.

General Gage wrote to Lord Dartmouth a week after Bunker Hill:

The rebels do not see that they have exchanged liberty for tyranny. No people were ever governed more absolutely than the American provinces now are; and no reason can be given for their submission but that it is tyranny which they have erected themselves.

According to the London Times, telegraphing under date of September 16, 1898, a private interview with Aguinaldo, it says:

The majority of the Filipinos have been struggling for freedom for years, indeed, for centuries, and now I believe they have obtained it. The only form of government he could understand was absolute independence. He had not studied political economy, and knew nothing about the various forms of government. He said: "We have no need of protection, because the Filipinos are able to cope with any army." He protested his undying gratitude to the Americans. "They came," he said, "only to fight the Spaniards, and now, having finished their task, they will return to America." He was unwilling to believe that the Americans would demand a reward for their humanity, and he declined to admit any necessity for a *quid pro quo*. He was confident that the Philippine republic would eventually build a navy, and that in the meantime the great nations would protect and aid a young nation, instead of grabbing its territories.

The Times, for September 20, says in a dispatch from Manila:

The insurgents, urged by constant rumors of the intention of America to reestablish Spanish rule in the archipelago, continue actively recruiting their army. Hundreds from Manila are enlisting daily, and troops are drilling everywhere. Great diligence is exhibited in imitating the American formation and manual, particularly in volley firing. The intrenchments in certain positions are being strengthened and a vigilant line of pickets is kept outside the suburbs. At the same time their attitude is much more friendly than before the evacuation. Several thousand rifles have recently been landed, and four new Maxim's. Nothing important is reported from the insurgent congress, which holds sessions daily at Malos."

September 24 the Times says:

The national assembly has decided to request the Americans (1) to recognize the independence of the Philippines; (2) to establish a protectorate relating only to external affairs, and to induce the powers to recognize the independence of the islands, and (3) to appoint a joint commission of Americans and Filipinos to arrange details as to how the Philippines shall reciprocate America's services.

On September 26, the London Times prints the following from its special correspondent, dated at Camp Dewey, near Manila, July 31, 1898.

The occupation of a portion of the insurgent lines, which was successfully accomplished on Friday morning, July 29, without irritation to the natives, was the first real move toward assuming the military responsibility of investing the town of Manila. This occupation was so diplomatically effected that the insurgents withdrew the small force which was in position near the seashore without protest and without delay, the only point insisted upon being the demand for a written receipt for the trenches. This point was covered by a concise letter from General Greene, announcing to Aguinaldo that the United States troops had taken possession of the works. The situation had become impossible. General Greene had established a picket line from the seashore extending along the cross roads about a mile inshore north of his camp and five or six hundred yards in the rear

of the insurgent rifle pits, and another between the camp and the back country. Whenever the insurgents made what they call an attack, the American pickets found themselves in a zone of very lively fire, because the Spanish Mauser bullets found lodgment exactly along that line, and most of the shells and shrapnel burst in the immediate vicinity of the pickets or the supports. It was very irritating to the men to endure the frequent fire without being able to return a shot.

During the entire time between the surrender of Manila to the outbreak of hostilities, February 1, 1899, not only did the Filipino government extend over the whole island, except the city of Manila, but the people of that city and the full strength of that city, as shown by the reports of our military and naval commanders, were on their side. But it was continually reenforcing and strengthening its armies in the field and procuring arms and military supplies. They were also doing their best to get a fleet, and they had in fact quite a number of ships, rudely enough armed I suppose, but constituting a naval service.

They charge Aguinaldo with a desire to loot Manila. Where is the evidence of that desire? Manila was full of his adherents, as our generals declared; there was a Masonic order there of 80,000 members, devoted, almost, to independence. It must have contained substantially every grown man in the city not a Spaniard or a foreigner.

Our generals all testify, and C. S. Wilcox testified, to the humane treatment of prisoners by the Filipinos. That treatment will compare favorably with the treatment of prisoners on either side in our own civil war; it will compare favorably with the treatment of prisoners by England in the Revolutionary war or the war of 1812.

Did he loot Iloilo? Did he loot a village or a single farmhouse throughout the length and breadth of the islands?

You can find, Mr. President, in the report of the Philippine Commission no facts that are not highly creditable to this people; the conjecture what they would do, the imputation of a purpose to plunder or loot, the imputation that Aguinaldo desired to establish a despotism, comes from a hostile fancy, and has no foundation whatever in fact.

I suppose no advocate of the policy of seizing the Philippine Islands by force, of compelling them to accept such government as we choose to impose upon them, will be likely to question the trustworthiness of the evidence of Major-General Otis. Nobody questions his zeal in that cause. Nobody questions his opportunity to know the facts. Indeed, the evidence furnished by him in his report of August 31, 1899, is made up largely of official documents. When he undertakes to penetrate the motives of the men with whom he is waging war, or engaged in diplomatic controversies or discussions, he is stating not facts but judgment, and his judgment is likely to be affected by the same influences that affect other good and able men in like circumstances, especially the judgment of good and able and patriotic men, that the authorities of their own country are engaged in discussions with the authorities of other countries, friendly or hostile.

Now it seems to me that it is impossible for any candid man to read carefully the report of General Otis without seeing that it absolutely overthrows, first, the claim that the people of the Philippine Islands are savages; second, that Aguinaldo and those associated with him are not actuated by an honest desire for independence and liberty; do not act and think exactly as Americans would act and think under the same circumstances, and

exactly as Americans have always acted and would always act and think under like circumstances; third, that they are incapable of self-government, or of establishing institutions based on justice and constitutional liberty; fourth, that they were in the least guilty of the outbreak of hostilities; and, fifth, that their action was in the least provoked, instigated, or affected by the expressions uttered on this side, of an opposition to the policy of conquest and imperialism, except so far as those expressions are found in the prior history of this country and in the declarations of its revered fathers and patriots, from George Washington and Sam Adams and Thomas Jefferson down to Abraham Lincoln and Charles Sumner to William McKinley, and down to the Senate of the United States when it passed the resolutions declaring our policy as to Cuba.

This is confirmed by General Otis's letter to Aguinaldo, dated November 2, 1898, speaking of the treatment of the Filipino people toward the Spanish Catholic clergy and nuns, he says:

I believe that a vast majority of the reports of great cruelty and barbarous treatment practiced by the Filipinos toward these individuals, which have been put in general circulation, are untrue. Indeed I have forbidden cablegrams prepared on this subject, which I had good reason to suppose could not be substantiated.

It would require more time than I have a right to take to-day to examine the evidence, and to cite the noble State papers which demonstrate the fitness of these people for independence. Admiral Dewey's estimate, never retracted, can never be conclusively shaken. General Wheeler, on his return, declared these people fit for self-government, as he expresses it, "of a certain sort." He explains that he means local and village self-government.

Mr. President, capacity for local and village self-government is capacity for the highest self-government, as the history of New England witnesses. But there is no greater and more pestilent delusion than the notion that a strong people may take away the liberty of a weak one, if we happen to think the weak one not fit for liberty.

But I will refer to a few of the many admirable State papers. Their written constitution is a masterpiece of statesmanship. They discuss questions of international law with our representatives, and show themselves fully a match for them in debate. I especially refer to the final appeal of Mabini to our commissioners, so noble and so mournful, and the poem composed by José Rizal, in his dungeon, the night before he met his death for his country.

SAN ISIDRO, April 29, 1899.

HONORABLE GENTLEMEN: The Philippine people, through its government, makes known to the commission that it has not yet lost its confidence in the friendship, justice, and magnanimity of the North American nation.

It feels itself weak before the advance of the American troops, whose valor it admires, and in view of the superiority of their organization, discipline, fighting material, and other resources, does not feel humiliated in soliciting peace, invoking the generous sentiments of the Government of the North American people, worthily represented by the commission, and the sacred interests of humanity.

But the Philippine government, fully convinced that it has not provoked war, and that it has only employed its arms in defense of the integrity of its native land, asks for a suspension of hostilities and a general armistice in all the archipelago for the short time of three months, in order to enable it to consult the opinions of the people concerning the government which would be most advantageous, and the intervention in it which should be given to the North American Government, and to appoint an extraordinary commission with full powers to act in the name of the Philippine people.

The welfare of this unfortunate country and the triumph of the governing party in the United States of America depend upon the prompt establishment of peace. We confess ourselves weak, but we still possess resources—above all the unshaking resolution to prolong the war for an indefinite space of time if the undertaking to dominate us by force is persisted in.

In laying before the commission the preceding statements I believe that I interpret the sentiments of my president and his government and those of the Philippine people.

I salute the commission with the greatest respect.

Your most obedient servant,

[SEAL.]

AP. MABINI.

Manifesto published by Ap. Mabini, on behalf of the Philippine government, at San Isidro, April 15, 1899.

(The manifesto begins by summarizing the terms of the proclamation recently issued by the American commission, and published in the "Oceania" of April 5, 1899. The benevolent intentions of the American Government, its proposal to establish "an enlightened system of government under which the Philippine people may enjoy the fullest autonomy and the most complete liberty consistent with the obligations and purposes" that Government has in view, its conclusion that American sovereignty is not incompatible with the rights and liberties of the Philippine people, and its threat to overwhelm by force those who do not recognize that sovereignty are recited in some detail. The fact that the commission proposes to introduce certain improvements and reforms in the political, judicial, and economic administration of the country is mentioned, and the manifesto continues as follows:)

Such is in abstract the address to the Philippine people of the American commissioners who, to inspire greater confidence, have not hesitated to have recourse to falsehood, shamelessly asserting that my government, by not having understood the good will and fraternal sentiments of their ambitious President, has provoked war, when everybody is aware that President McKinley had to decree war in order to force the American Senators of the opposition to ratify the cession of the Philippines stipulated in the treaty of Paris, thus sacrificing to his ambition the welfare of two peoples, who ought to be united by an eternal friendship.

You clearly see that the North American Government undertakes to extend its sovereignty over the Philippine Islands, basing its claim upon a title null and void. This title is the treaty of Paris, agreed to by the Spanish-American Commission the 10th of last December, and ratified, according to the commission that signs this address, by the American Government some weeks ago, and by that of Spain on the 20th of last March. This contract to cede the islands was concerted and concluded when the Spanish domination had already ceased in the Philippines, thanks to the triumph of our arms. Moreover, in this act of cession no voice whatever was allowed the representatives of the Philippine people to which belongs the sovereignty of the islands by natural right and international laws. What a spectacle it is to see at the end of the century, called the century of enlightenment and of civilization, a people jealous and proud of its own sovereignty employing all its great powers, the result of its own continued free existence, to wrest from another people, weak but worthy of a better fate, the very rights which in its own case it believes to be inherent by law natural and divine! And how discouraging the cold and indifferent attitude, in the face of such a scandalous usurpation, taken by the great powers to whom Providence confides the high mission and the great means of guarding universal peace and justice. But no matter! We shall fight till the last breath to vindicate our own sovereignty, our independence. If the North American people is great and powerful, far greater and more powerful is Providence which watches over the unfortunate and chastises and humbles the proud. We have suffered so much in our own interests that perhaps we are quick to recognize misery. Thus, if we should lay down our arms, we should leave our sons without liberty and without the means of retrieving our fortune, and moreover we should bequeath to them all the penalties and sufferings of a conflict which of necessity they would have to face if to-day we do not release them from this task. If overwhelmed by misery and weighed down by the chains of servitude, you should picture to yourselves the sad future of your posterity, will you not a thousand times prefer death? To this lamentable state of despair would all those be reduced who without reflection allow themselves to be deceived by the specious promises of the American commission.

On the other hand, these promises, when examined, amount to nothing in practice. They are such as political parties ordinarily use to secure power, and wholly disregard once their object is attained. For it is very easy to promise when no obligation or legal responsibility to perform the promise is incurred. And moreover—be assured of this—the North American Government has not wanted and does not want to recognize our independence, because this recognition will bind it to make formal agreement with us and not to fail or depart from the terms of this agreement. For this reason I have sought it from the beginning, but the representatives of the North American Government have always refused to accord to my government an official character, having recourse first to coercion and finally to instigating war. They promised to aid us in the attainment of our liberty, and you have seen how they have just provoked us to war for being unwilling to lose our liberty by recognizing their sovereignty.

Apparently it pleases them better to have no sort of agreement with us, in order that they may make of us what best suits them, as soon as they have subjected us to their rule. It would be more to their advantage to promise us the greatest improvements in all kinds of industries and means of communication in order afterwards to possess themselves of our properties and control of all industries with the help of their great capital, reducing us to the condition of partners, or porters and workmen, if not mere domestics and servants. It is a clever and ingenious scheme, to promise us the amplest autonomy and the fullest political liberty, that afterwards they may oppress us at will, under the pretext that the concessions of liberty are prejudicial to their rights of sovereignty and international obligations. We were the equals of the Spaniards before the laws of Spain, but we in no case obtained justice without recourse to vile and underhand means and without incurring an interminable series of humiliations, for wherever we betook ourselves race-hatred pursued us, and that hatred is much more violent, cruel, and pitiless among the Anglo-Saxons.

Open your eyes, my dear countrymen, while there is yet time. Fight without truce or respite, without faltering or desponding, without measuring the duration of the conflict, the forces of the enemy, or the greatness of the sacrifices. Build not on others your happiness and welfare, for selfishness and interest prevail in the relations of individuals, of cities, and of nations, above all when they are separated by the impassable chasm opened by race hatred. Even when the Constitution of the United States is declared law in the Philippine Islands and the North American Congress accords us all, absolutely all, the rights and liberties of American citizens, and a state government, recognized by the Constitution—which is the greatest good annexation can bring us—race hatred will curtail these prerogatives, especially since section 10 of article 1 of the Constitution prohibits each State from imposing taxes on imports and exports (the products of such taxes belonging to the Treasury of the United States), and from passing laws on this point without the approval of Congress. Under this section we should not be able, without the approval of the same Congress, to lay any taxes on tonnage, nor maintain in time of peace troops and war ships to command respect for the liberties and rights we had acquired. Annexation, in whatever form it may be adopted, will unite us forever to a nation whose manners and customs are different from our own, a nation which hates the colored race with a mortal hatred, and from which we could never separate ourselves except by war.

And since war is the last resource that is left to us for the salvation of our country and our own national honor, let us fight while a grain of strength is left us; let us acquit ourselves like men, even though the lot of the present generation in conflict and sacrifice. It matters not whether we die in the midst or at the end of our most painful day's work; the generations to come, praying over our tombs, will shed for us tears of love and gratitude, and not of bitter reproach.

By authority of the president of the republic and its government.

AP. MABINI.

SAN ISIDRO, April 15, 1899.

#### NOTES ON THE MESSAGE OF GENERAL MILLER.

Firstly. The succession of the sovereignty of the United States to that of Spain is based on three facts, viz:

The destruction of the Spanish squadron, on the surrendering at Manila of the Spanish army, and on the treaty of Paris.

Let us examine the validity of the reasons alleged.

After the destruction of the Spanish squadron in the bay of Manila the American squadron remained there as master of the sea in those parts. This fact being based on undeniable facts, the destruction of the Spanish and the victory of the North American squadron, we admit the same without any reserve whatever.

The surrendering of the Spanish army at Manila caused the Americans to establish there a government of military occupation. If this essentially military fact furnished the only and sufficient cause for the establishment of the government of occupation, then the sovereignty of the United States must needs remain restricted to the city of Manila, for the same principle must then be applied to the townships which were conquered by the army of deliverance of the Philippines; and over and above that the sovereignty thus acquired by our Army must

needs be considered as being much better justified, as the Philippine army achieved what it did without any foreign help and assistance, while on the other hand the Army of the United States would never have succeeding in taking Manila without the narrow and strong girdle of iron that our armies had laid around it.

Assuming the above premises to be correct, and applying the same to the territory of Bisayas, we can not see how here the sovereignty of the United States is to be established, for here, to be sure, we have neither a sea nor a land battle where the Americans have in any way participated.

To take the matter up from that point of view betrays but a puerile conception, and we ourselves merely drew the consequences to show how easily the argument brought forth by the American Government can be refuted.

The fact however is, that the cession of the Philippine Islands by the Spanish in favor of the Americans, and accepted by the latter nation, constitutes a violation of the sacred interest of the Philippine nation and an act of bad faith on the side of the United States. For, to be sure, a long time before the breaking out of the Spanish-American difficulties the Philippines were fighting, as they are fighting now and will always fight, for their liberty and independence; and the American nation in allying itself with our army for the destruction of the Spanish dominion has contracted a moral and political responsibility of the first order; it has, indeed, contracted the plainest obligation to aid and abet the realization of the just aspirations of the Philippines. The simplest conclusion from what we have said would be to assume that, on the Spanish suggesting the cession of the Philippine Islands (for surely we must not assume that the cession has to be traced back to the initiative of the United States), the United States would at once have considered it an act of pure justice to ascertain with regard to this matter the wishes of the Philippine nation, its ally. For, having lent to the latter to a certain extent its help in the battle for liberty and independence, it could easily be conceived that the Philippines would not suffer a new reign, least of all of a nation on whose conscience the curse of the Redskins rests as a heavy load.

Secondly. The military government which is proposed for the islands is supposed to "establish security for persons and private property on the islands," etc., etc., but, to be sure, also from this point of view we could easily dispense with said government, for both natives and foreigners, if at all sincere, can not but acknowledge that here as well as every where where the Philippine government has been established the public order has been fully and thoroughly established.

Thirdly. As regards the fact that General Miller is in a position, as he says, to occupy at any time and any moment with his forces the fortress and city of Iloilo, we do not doubt that the intention is entertained all right; but we can not help wondering considerably that so far he has not carried out such an intention.

Headquarters at Jaro, January 3, 1899.

MACARIO ADRIATICO.

Issue of the 8th of January, 1900.

Once in a while we read or hear in the course of this discussion some counsel as to our dealing with this people, based on the character of what is called the "Asiatic mind." I suppose that notion comes directly or indirectly from Englishmen. In the beginning the rule of England in Asia was a rule of pure force. The highest type of civilization, and, as we like to think, of human intellect, met a lower type. It had the superiority in every element of strength, except justice. The weaker races met the stronger race as weakness always meets strength—with dissimulation and deceit. England, of late, has tried a better method, and is meeting with better success.

But do you not think, Mr. President, that this talk about the Asiatic mind involves some audacity of generalization? Why, there are in Asia, I suppose, nearly or quite 800,000,000 people—more than half the population of the globe. You might as well talk about the human mind, drawing your conclusions alone from the Fiji islanders, or about the American mind, drawing your conclusions from the Patagonians. There is as much difference between the fatalists who submit to the rule of the Sultan in Turkey and the gentle and philosophic Buddhist, and the busy, ambitious, enterprising Japanese, who have taken their place among the foremost of civilized nations in half a century, or these Filipinos with whom we are dealing, their hearts full of the passion for republican liberty, as between the haughty and

effeminate Spaniard and the brave, sturdy, constant, and wise Swede or Norwegian. You might as well invite us to subdue Denmark and draw an inference of her unfitness for self-government from the Spaniards as to impute to this race, whose liberty you ask us to crush out, what you call the "Asiatic mind."

The state papers of Aguinaldo, the discussion of the law of nations by his attorney-general, the masterly appeal of Mabini, are products of the Asiatic mind. They are not unworthy of the Asiatic mind, the vehicle through which came to us the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, the poetry of David, the eloquence of Isaiah, the wisdom of Solomon, the profound philosophy of Paul. A pure and unmixed Asiatic race, during the century just closing, has given to Europe its masters in finance, in art, in the drama, in music, and to England a statesman who by the force of his own unaided genius brought a proud aristocracy to his feet. It is not quite time to dismiss contemptuously eight hundred million of the human race to the class of inferior races, and almost to the class of inferior animals.

#### HOW HOSTILITIES CAME TO PASS.

An attempt has been made to shift the responsibility for this war to the men who resisted it. It has not been very successful. No man whose intellectual ears are not long enough to reach from here to the Philippine Islands is likely to believe that these men were instigated to fight—not by the men who undertook to buy them like sheep and pay for them in gold; who were looking with greedy eyes on their lands, and their coal, and their mines of precious metals, and their hemp-bearing fields; who were hurrying soldiers and men-of-war to their islands after they had made peace with their old tyrant, but by the men who resisted all these things, who counseled peace, who desired that we should let them alone, unless they asked our help.

When I spoke in the Senate on the 9th of January, 1899, which was the beginning of the public debate, except a constitutional argument made by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT], there had been a declaration of war on both sides. General Miller lay with his soldiers in the bay of Iloilo. He had been for weeks urging General Otis to give him the order to attack, pleading that the insurgents were strengthening their forces in the city and increasing his difficulty every day. The President's proclamation claiming sovereignty and ordering Otis to enforce it had been made public. Aguinaldo had met it by a counter proclamation declaring that if there were any attack made on the Visayas, he and his people would fight. That proclamation of Aguinaldo's had been pasted over all the walls of Manila, a city full of his adherents. Allowing for the difference of time, that was more than twenty-four hours before I spoke and nearly forty-eight hours before my speech was made public.

Now what was it that brought this thing to pass? What was it that substituted for the gratitude of that people when they pressed about our consuls and our soldiers early in the year 1898, welcoming them as deliverers, welcoming them almost as angels from heaven—a feeling first of doubt, then of suspicion, then of sullen dislike, then of fierce hatred, and finally culminating in war to the death? If you would answer this question, ask yourself what the American people would have done in a like case. Ask yourself what you would have done in a like case. Think of

the lessons you have received from your fathers, and the lessons I doubt not you have handed down to your sons. This people had gone joyously about the work of building up their republic. They had established local governments all over the islands. They were eager to learn the English language—the native language of freedom. They were studying the lives of our own great patriots and liberators. They had driven the Spaniards from their soil, save for a single city, and, whether right or wrong, they were confident of their capacity to capture that. They had been furnished with arms. Aguinaldo and his companions had been brought over, and the work for which they had been brought over and armed had been done. Now they find, first, a constant and contemptuous treatment in private of their soldiers by ours, which the American, I am sorry to say, almost alone among civilized nations, extends to the people of other races. But they found also that the promises we were making them were vague and ambiguous. The old frank talk of the consuls, though never disavowed by our Administration, was never repeated except in three or four special cases where we were trying to get some advantage from them. We had used them. We had profited by them. We had squeezed the orange, and it now seemed we were not unlikely to be ready to throw away the peel. They found that the American press and American public speakers were beginning to talk less and less of liberty and more and more of trade. The words justice, freedom, righteousness seemed to be disappearing from our vocabulary. Then after the capture of Manila, when General Otis had declared that not more than 5,000 soldiers would be necessary to keep the peace in that entire archipelago of 1,200 islands, they saw we were hurrying over reenforcements and increasing our naval and military strength. Then came the tone of demand and of authority. President McKinley had said again and again and again in public speech that we had no rightful title to a foot of the territory in those islands outside of the limits of Manila. And yet our generals were demanding with unconcealed threats the contraction of their lines and the expansion of ours. Then came the President's proclamation; the substitution for it by General Otis of one reaffirming the promises of independence, and the unfortunate accident by which both these proclamations came out together.

Now, I should think that might look to the Asiatic mind as disingenuous and portraying a purpose to deception. Of course we know it was pure accident. We know the honorable character of the President and the honorable character of General Otis. But suppose there had come out after Yorktown a proclamation by the King of France claiming that he had bought sovereignty over the whole of our thirteen colonies, and directing his generals to enforce it, and then on the same day a proclamation from the French commander assuring us that we were to be free and independent as the most-favored province on earth. Would not there have been indignation? Would not there have been, even in the staid Puritan mind, a flame of fire? Would not there have been war? The only difference between that case and this is that I do not think there would have been a Frenchman found reckless enough to have attributed the event to a speech in the French Assembly counseling peace and protesting against that dishonor.

How idle to attribute this condition of things, going on for seven

months, to the effect of pamphlets and speeches made ten thousand miles away, most of them made long after this condition of things became established! There is one simple key to the history of those seven months. Apply that solution and everything is accounted for; everything falls into its natural order. Suppose the Filipinos to be governed by the same motives which would have governed you or any liberty-loving American in their condition. Suppose a people thirsting for liberty, desiring self-government and independence, menaced by a superior power, ready to defend their principles to the death if need be, and yet in the light of the history of their mighty antagonists, incredulous that such a thing can be possible. Every fact that reaches us from any trustworthy source is in this way explained, and can be explained in no other way. It was the spirit of liberty stirring the people of the Philippine Islands as of old it stirred the Englishman; as of old it stirred the Swiss; as of old it stirred the Swede; as of old it stirred the Greek; and as in the earlier and better days of Spain it stirred the Spaniards themselves. And when word came to the Filipino from our country, dedicated to and founded upon liberty, of a treaty to destroy his independence, and with an offer, most insulting to all manly hearts, to give him good government from without, this Asiatic vindicated his right to stand by the side of liberty-loving nations of all mankind. If he could not be there, at least he could die.

Now, there is a marvelous resemblance between the condition of the people of the Philippine Islands during the last year and that of Spain when she was overrun by Napoleon. The Filipinos who side with Aguinaldo, are thoroughly as fit for self-government as were the people of Spain. If Admiral Dewey be right in comparing them with the people of Cuba, they were far fitter. Napoleon undertook to give them what he called a good government. The story of the Spaniards' brave resistance has been told better than any living lips can tell it by the greatest of English poets since Milton, William Wordsworth. This is his description of the feeling of the Spaniards, and this is his description of the resistance of the Spaniards:

THE FRENCH AND THE SPANISH GUERRILLAS.

Hunger, and sultry heat, and nipping blast  
 From bleak hilltop, and length of march by night  
 Through heavy swamp, or over snow-clad height—  
 These hardships ill-sustained, these dangers past,  
 The roving Spanish bands are reached at last,  
 Charged, and dispersed like foam; but as a flight  
 Of scattered quails by signs do reunite,  
 So these—and, heard of once again, are chased  
 With combination of long-practiced art  
 And newly kindled hope; but they are fled,  
 Gone are they, viewless as the buried dead:  
 Where now? Their sword is at the foeman's heart!  
 And thus from year to year his walk they thwart,  
 And hang like dreams around his guilty bed.

Aguinaldo, as I have said, met our proclamation of December 24 with his proclamation affirming his purpose to resist. He also reissued the decree of June 18, 1898, which I will print with my remarks:

DECREE OF THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT OF LUZON REGARDING THE ORGANIZATION OF LOCAL BOARDS, TO BE PUT IN FORCE THROUGHOUT THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

*To the Philippine Nation:*

Providence has placed me in a position for the sustaining of which I can not but feel my natural deficiency, but since I can not oppose myself to the commands of Providence nor shirk the duties imposed upon me by honor and patriotism, it is from this position that I salute thee, O my beloved country.

I have proclaimed to the whole world that the aspiration of my whole life, the final object of all my strength and efforts, is none other than thy independence, for I have the firm conviction that this represents thy constant desire, as independence signifies for us the redemption from slavery and tyranny, the recovery of our lost liberty, and the entering into the ranks of the civilized nations.

I understand, also, full well that the first duty of every government is the faithful interpretation of the wishes of the people. Therefore, although the abnormal conditions produced by the war have forced me to institute this dictatorial government, which comprises the full civil and military power, my constant wish has been to surround myself with the most prominent persons from each province, who by their bearing have gained the confidence of the same, in order that, learning from them the real needs of each province, I may adopt the most efficacious means for remedying and supplying them to the extent desired by all.

I appreciate, besides that, the pressing necessity of establishing in each town a solid and lasting organization as a stronghold for public security and as the only means for insuring the union and discipline indispensable for establishing the republic; that is, the government of the people by the people, and to avoid international conflicts that might occur.

In virtue of the considerations expounded, I decree the following:

ARTICLE 1. The inhabitants of each township still held by the Spanish will agree as to the best means to combat and annihilate the same according to the resources at their disposal, giving to the prisoners of war the treatment most conformable to the sentiments of humanity and the customs observed by cultured nations.

ARTICLE 2. As soon as a township is liberated from Spanish dominion, the inhabitants prominent by their education, social standing, and honorable character, both in the township itself and the district, will convene in a general assembly, which will proceed to elect by a majority of votes the mayor of the town and a head of each district, the center of the city proper also to be considered as a district.

All inhabitants complying with the conditions mentioned above, and provided they are friends of the Philippine independence and have attained their twenty-first year, can take part in this assembly and can be elected.

ARTICLE 3. In the same assembly also three delegates will be elected by a majority of votes, one for the police, the other as justice and civil registrar, the third as tax collector and assessor.

The chief of police will assist the mayor in the organization of the armed force which each township is to maintain to the extent of its resources, and for the preservation of order, good morals, and the hygiene of the place.

The justice and civil registrar will assist the mayor in the administration of justice, and by keeping the registers of births, deaths, marriage contracts, and the census.

The tax collector and assessor will assist the mayor in the collection of the taxes, administration of the public funds, the cattle and cadastral registers, and in every other branch of administration.

ARTICLE 4. The mayor, as chairman, with the heads of the districts and with the delegates referred to, are to form the "boards" who are to enforce the fulfillment of the laws and ordinances, and who are to look out for the special interests of each township.

The head of the center districts will act as vice-chairman of the board and the justice as secretary.

The heads of the districts will act as representatives of the mayor in their respective districts.

ARTICLE 5. The mayors of every township, after having obtained the advice of their respective boards, are to assemble and elect by a majority of votes the chief of the province and three councilors for the three branches referred to above.

The chief of the province as president, the mayor of the principal town of the province as secretary, and the three councilors constitute the provincial council, which will see that the dispositions of this government are carried out in their province, and which will take charge of the general interest of the province, and propose to this Government such measures as may be conducive to the welfare of all.

ARTICLE 6. Said chiefs of the provinces will elect also by a majority of votes three representatives for each of the provinces of Manila and Cavite, two for each of the provinces classified as such in the Spanish legislation, and one each for all the other provinces and political and military commanderies in the Philippine Archipelago.

Said representatives will take charge of the general interests of the archipelago, as well as of the special interest of their respective provinces, and will constitute the revolutionary congress, which will propose to the present government all measures regarding the order in the interior and the exterior safety of the islands, and will be consulted by the government in all important questions which admit of delay or waiting.

ARTICLE 7. The persons elected for any of the offices referred to can not enter upon them unless properly confirmed by this government, which will issue the confirmation upon presentation of the documents of election.

The documents of election will serve as credentials for the respective persons.

**ARTICLE 8.** The military chiefs nominated by this government in each province are not to interfere with the management and administration of the same, confining themselves to ask for such assistance in troops or material as they may need from the chiefs of the provinces and the mayors of the towns, who, in case of actual necessity, are not to refuse such assistance.

If, however, a province is in part or as a whole threatened or occupied by the enemy, the military chief highest in rank is entitled to assume all the functions of a chief of the province until the danger has disappeared.

**ARTICLE 9.** The government will name for every province a commissioner for the special purpose of carrying out the provisions of this decree referring to the organization, and that in compliance with the instructions which the government will communicate to him. The military chiefs who liberate a township from Spanish rule are commissioners *ex officio*.

Said commissioners will preside over the first assembly in each town in the respective provinces.

**ARTICLE 10.** As soon as the organization which forms the object of the present decree is effected, all nominations for civil offices previously made are canceled, whatever may be their origin, and all dispositions which are in opposition to the present decree are abolished.

Issued at Cavite the 18th of June, 1898.

EMILIO AGUINALDO.

Another charge has been made. It would not be entitled to serious consideration but for the fact that it has been widely circulated. It is that by the delay in the Senate in ratifying the treaty of peace the rebellion in the Philippine Islands found some comfort and support. I have seen it stated a hundred times that if the Senate had promptly ratified the treaty there would have been no war. The Senate had ratified the treaty when Aguinaldo informed our generals in command that he regretted the outbreak of the 5th of February, and proposed to withdraw his troops to a greater distance; that he wanted no hostilities, and trusted there would be no more of them, and was met with the reply that as the fight had begun it must go on.

But this treaty, considering its importance, was before the Senate for a marvelously short time. It was before the Senate for a shorter time than a large majority of all the treaties in our history, important or unimportant. It was signed at Paris on the 10th of December, 1898. It was sent to the Senate and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations on the 4th of January, 1899. On the 11th of January, seven days afterwards, it was reported back from the Committee on Foreign Relations without amendment. On the 25th of January there was a unanimous agreement for a vote on the 6th of February, and on that day the treaty was ratified—with a single vote to spare. From all these proceedings the injunction of secrecy was removed.

Now, Mr. President, the Committee on Foreign Relations had 11 members, 3 of whom were on the commission that made the treaty; and it took that committee seven days to make its report, with 3 of its members thoroughly familiar with the whole subject, on which I presume it does not require much boldness to say nearly every other member had made up his mind. It was before the Senate but twenty-six days—before a Senate crowded with all the other business of a short session. If a body of 11 men specially learned and familiar with that subject required seven days for sufficient discussion and debate, was twenty-six days an unreasonable time for a body of 90 Senators without special familiarity with the great subject?

I think I know something of the state of mind of Senators on both sides of that question; certainly I know the state of mind of many Senators among those who were opposed to the treaty; and I affirm that if there were any delay, any desire or purpose of

delay anywhere, which added one hour to the interval between the report of the treaty and the final vote, that purpose or desire was not in the minds of the opposition. No, Mr. President, it is as certain as anything can be certain that if there had been a single assurance on the part of our Executive of a purpose to recognize the Filipinos in the independence they had won, or, at any rate, had largely helped to win (while we captured 10,000 prisoners, they captured 9,000; while we captured a single city, they captured the rest of the territory); if, I say, there had been a single assurance that we intended to respect the independence to which they aspired, there would have been no war.

If we had dealt with them in the treaty of peace as we dealt with Cuba there would have been no war.

If we had not hurried reinforcements to Manila, both of ships and of men, strengthening the forces of our army and navy there, after Spain had yielded, there would have been no war.

If the urgent request of Aguinaldo, after the outbreak of the 5th of February, that hostilities might cease, had not been met by the declaration of Otis that "fighting must go on," there would have been no war.

If Aguinaldo's offer to withdraw his troops and make a wider belt between the two armies had been met in a like spirit, there would have been no war.

If Senators had not been talking about holding on to all they could get, about making money out of their great act of liberation, about keeping from the people of these islands their liberty and their independence, for purposes of gain and trade, there would have been no war.

And now the attempt to charge this thing upon those of us who have but proclaimed the doctrine of the Declaration of Independence, and have but repeated again the Cuban resolutions; who have but quoted the language of the President of the United States—the responsibility for these hostilities is a proceeding not matched in impudence since the day of the upstream wolf and the downstream lamb.

The trouble with our imperialistic friends is that they can not understand that conscience, patriotism, or love of liberty can exist in other men. If they would but put themselves in the place of the Filipinos; if they would but apply the golden rule to the relations between this country and this people—this people of the Eastern Hemisphere, from which the golden rule came in the beginning. If the Filipinos knew enough of what was going on in the United States to be moved, to risk life and everything that makes life dear in the hope that their liberty might be granted, from reading the speeches of political leaders, articles in the newspapers, or debates in the Senate, is it not quite likely that they may have heard also of the Declaration of Independence, of our Constitution, of the writings of Jefferson, of the speeches of Lincoln, and of recent Presidential utterances? Is it not likely that they would attribute as much weight to them as to the speeches of Mr. Schurz, the letters of Mr. Edmunds, or the pamphlets of Mr. Atkinson? Had they not a right to believe them? Had they not a right to think that the people of the United States thought that there should be no government imposed upon them but with their consent? That the people of the United States thought that annexing them by force would be criminal aggression; that the doctrine that government rested upon the consent of the governed is a universal obligation; that

it is applicable to every people the round world over; that it applies not only to some men but to all men?

They tell us this question is settled. Is it settled? If it be settled, who settled it? Not the American people. The American people have never voted to change their government from a republic, by which every man has his equal share, into an empire governing ten or twelve million people, benevolently it may be, but in an absolutely unchecked despotism, without a single constitutional restraint. The American people have never voted that the Declaration of Independence is only a revolutionary pronunciamento which the men who made it have been constantly violating. They have never admitted yet that the Supreme Court of the United States was all wrong when, within ten years, they said that the Declaration of Independence was the spirit of our Government, of which the Constitution was only the form and letter. They have never declared as yet that George Washington and Thomas Jefferson and John Quincy Adams and Daniel Webster and Abraham Lincoln and Charles Sumner and John Marshall were false prophets. Congress has not settled it. You have not, so far, had a vote that we would undertake to rule unwilling and vassal States. We were expressly told when the treaty was up—the Senator from Georgia [Mr. CLAY] has shown that seven of the nine men who spoke for the treaty expressly admitted it—that it was to settle nothing, but only to put an end to the war with Spain, and that afterwards we would determine whether we would keep in subjection the people of the Philippine Islands. Why, our excellent and honored President himself declared again and again and again, all over the country, that the question was for Congress and not for him, and that it was his duty only to restore order and to keep order until Congress should act. When we asked you last year to give the same assurances in the matter of the Philippine Islands that you had given already in the matter of Cuba, and said that if Cuba was of right and ought to be free and independent, certainly this people, with their constitution, their achieved independence, their public order, their schools, their universities, their village governments, were and of right ought to be free and independent, we were answered: "We won't give assurances to men with arms in their hands." I did not think the answer a good one then. I thought some assurance needed to be given to the American people as well as to the Filipinos and that, hard as was the lot of that struggling people, the injury of which the American people was in danger, was worse than any meditated to them. Meantime we hurried over our reinforcements and fought our battles and conquered our enemy; and now you turn upon us and say that you did not mean what you said then and that the whole thing was settled a year ago.

A little more than fourteen months ago there were presented to the Senate two propositions in sharp contrast with each other. One was a proposition to deal with the Philippine Islands as we dealt with Cuba; to assure them of their liberty; to protect them against foreign ambition and to lend our aid in restoring order; to speed them with our blessing on the pathway of freedom and independence, equal among independent nations, making such treaties with them for future commerce and intercourse as our advantage and theirs would require and as their good will and gratitude might be willing to grant.

The other was to buy them like slaves; to pay for them in gold:

to set up against them the dishonored and discredited title of Spain, and to conquer them to a sullen submission and to a future of perpetual hatred and fear.

The Senate took its choice. We have had twelve months' experience. We can tell already something of the cost of this thing. It has cost us more than one hundred and fifty millions in money. An increase over 1898 of the cost of Army of more than one hundred and twenty-two millions; of the Navy, of six millions; of the pension list, four millions.

But all this is the merest trifle. It has cost us the lives of 6,000 men who are dead. It has wrecked the lives of other thousands, victims of disease and of wounds. It compels us to maintain in the future a large and costly military and naval force.

You are to keep certainly, hereafter, 50,000 private soldiers, in the flower of their youth, in that tropical clime. What is to be their fate?

Mr. President, worse than the most lavish expenditure, worse than the heaviest burden of national debt, worse than the loss of precious lives, worse than the reduction of wages, worse than the overthrow of our settled fiscal policies, is the price, the terrible price, we are to pay, if there be any lesson to be learned from human experience, in the souls of the young men we are to send as soldiers to the Tropics. Have you read the horrible, the unquotable story which comes from the English official reports of the life of the common soldiers of the English army in India? I wonder if our enthusiastic gentlemen, who prate so glibly of dominion and empire—I wonder if our well-meaning clergymen, who fancy themselves preaching the gospel of Christ to these yellow congregations, have read anything or care anything for the lessons of experience?

Hardly a department of the Government does not add some items of cost incident to a control or a knowledge of the late Spanish possessions.

The government of these islands will be a military government, to be assisted and gradually superseded by civil officers. No sums adequate to the purpose have been asked for, nor has any money been asked to construct and equip coast and harbor defenses necessary to military occupation or for the improvement of harbors and waterways, cleansing cities and towns, construction and maintenance of military and other railroads, relief of the needy, and the many items of expense incident to the occupation of distant and unprotected possessions, peopled by poor and untaught natives, oppressed into insurrection, and at present undisciplined to control of any kind. To keep the army of occupation of sufficient strength will involve a fearful drain upon the population of the United States, equal to more than double the loss of an army in a great battle. The cost of administering justice will not be small; the actual and constant rebellion of the natives against our rule is a strong probability, and the sullen opposition of a home-rule element must be faced and met. The islands do not promise to be self-supporting to the extent of providing for such contingencies as rebellion, and so the annual cost to the people of the United States must be increased, even as an insurance against an uprising.

Assuming that the War Department has asked for a sum sufficient to assure the occupation of the islands and a proper establishment for police purposes, it will be seen there are other large

and uncertain items of cost unprovided for, and the annual appropriations will in future be nearer \$200,000,000 in excess of those of 1898 than \$155,712,751.

An annual increased expenditure of \$200,000,000 means a continuance of existing "war taxes" and the imposition of new taxes, or borrowing by the Government to meet current expenses.

The total revenue from the great and regular sources of income for the fiscal year 1898 was—

From internal revenue .....	\$170,900,641
From customs .....	149,575,062
From miscellaneous sources .....	20,000,000
Total .....	\$40,415,703

The amounts derived from the sales of the Pacific roads, a windfall not to be repeated, brought the total income to \$405,821,335. Compared with the appropriations for 1898, there would have been a deficit of \$27,748,405, or, excluding the sums received from the Pacific roads, one of \$92,499,639. This on a peace basis.

An average deficit of \$100,000,000 will be below rather than above the actual to be expected. This means the taking each year from productive industry of a sum representing the interest (at 3 per cent) on a capital of \$3,333,000,000, and, as a standing charge, is equivalent to adding that sum to the capital of the national debt, with this difference—the bonds of the national debt are redeemable after a certain number of years, but this new charge represents a perpetual debt.

The capital of the debt of the United States at the end of 1898 was \$1,047,320,000. The new expenditure will be equivalent to increasing it to \$4,380,000,000. The debt of France is \$6,218,871,341; Great Britain, \$3,203,868,395. This gives us the second largest public debt in the world. In 1898 the per capita rate of taxation for national purposes was \$4.34 a year.

But let us look at the cost other than in money. We are to give up many of the ideals (I had almost said every ideal) of the Republic. We must give up our great, priceless possessions; more precious than jewels or gold, more precious than land or power. The counsels of Washington are for us no longer; the truths of the Declaration of Independence are no longer our maxims of government; the Monroe doctrine, to which one hemisphere owes its freedom, is gone. The counsels of Lincoln, to give effect to which he repeatedly declared he would welcome assassination itself, are not to be listened to hereafter, or, if listened to, it will be by other ears than ours.

Another thing we have lost by last winter's terrible blunder. We lost the right to speak with authority in favor of peace at The Hague. The world took, I hope and believe, a forward step in that great conference. But think what might have been! We have lost the right to offer our sympathy to the Boer in his wonderful and gallant struggle against terrible odds for the republic in Africa.

"O Freedom dear, if ever man was free,  
In all the ages, earned thy favoring smile,  
This patient man has earned it. In his cause  
Pleads all the world to-day"—

all the world, except the nation that is engaged in crushing out a republic in the Philippines.

We have lost our power to speak with authority in behalf of the disarmament of nations. We must prepare ourselves for a great standing army. We already hear the demand for a large

standing army, and a navy equal to that of England. The American child hereafter must be born with a mortgage round his neck. The American laborer hereafter must stagger through life with a soldier on his back.

Already we hear the doctrine preached in high places that the Constitution was intended for a small people and not for a large one.

Mr. President, a republic without a constitution is like a man without a conscience. In it is the great principle of the equality of men and manhood; from it, citizenship gets its value and labor its dignity. You have lost now the character of the great liberator, and are to take for the future the character of the great enslaver. Now, what have you to show for all this? You have imported two or three cargoes of hemp from Manila and you have benevolently assimilated the Sultan of Sulu. If you refuse to admit their products as from a part of the United States, you have got hereafter to govern them not for their interest, but for your own. Where you used to talk of liberty you are henceforth to talk only of tobacco. Your diplomacy with other nations must be not for their interest, but for yours. Will you let them make their own trade arrangements with England or with China?

Your currency laws must be made hereafter, not for their interest, but for yours, as England regulates the currency of India.

Mr. President, I can not conceal my sense of the ridiculousness, the pettiness, the vulgarity, of talking about trade and money getting, and exports and imports, and what we are to gain, in what should be the sublime hour of a people's liberation. Think of the conqueror, the liberator, the hero, saying to the world, "I shall sutler be unto the camp, and profits will ensue."

It is said that it is not a sordid argument, or a sordid nation, that considers the advantage of trade and commercial intercourse, and that is true if the argument be used in its proper place. The consideration becomes a sordid, a base, and ignoble argument when we use it to determine the question whether we shall do justice.

When you are tempted to take what belongs to another, to crush out the liberties of a people, then the suggestion that you are to make money by the transaction becomes as sordid and base a suggestion as ever was whispered into a covetous and greedy ear.

When you are asked to abandon your cherished principles, your lofty ideals, your benevolent influence on mankind, to turn your polar star, your morning star, into a comet, the suggestion of money getting seems to me infinitely pitiful.

Mr. President, another thing you have got to think of. You have got to meet squarely, and to look squarely in the face, the great question of church and state. We must decide, and decide pretty soon, whether the larger part of the real estate in those islands is to be held by the religious orders, or whether we must follow the example of our English ancestors, with statutes of mortmain and trust, or whether we shall exert a power not given to Congress by the Constitution, of confiscation and despoliation.

I have been somewhat impressed by the desire of some of our imperialistic friends to avoid any responsibility for themselves in this matter and to place it all on God. I suppose these gentlemen think that every successful act of tyranny is to be charged to the Deity; certainly it is a very convenient method of getting rid of responsibility.

Is God guilty, in the opinion of these gentlemen, of the partition of Poland? Did God keep the fair isles of Greece under the feet of Turkey? Did God plunder our missionaries and torture Christians in Armenia? Did God enact the fugitive slave law? It must needs be that offenses come, but woe unto that man and woe unto that nation from whom the offense cometh.

"An impious, evil man," said the Greek orator Isocrates, "might get off if he chanced to die before he paid the penalty for his crimes; but the immortality of a State leaves it no escape from the vengeance of men or of the gods."

The President says: "I will bear your banner to a triumphant peace?" What a triumphant peace would have been ours if we had dealt with the Philippines as we dealt with Cuba.

I said last year that our commissioners came back from Paris bringing with them the cast-off clothing of the pinchbeck Napoleon, and asked us, who have seen his fate, to discard for it the spotless robes in which our fathers arrayed the beautiful genius of America.

Mr. President, it is worse than that. If we take these islands to govern as despots govern their subjects, Spain will have revenged herself upon us. Spain will be the victor, and we the vanquished. She will have revenged herself upon us as the dying monster Nessus revenged himself upon Hercules when he persuaded the beautiful Dejanira to give to the conqueror the garment steeped in his own poisoned blood. The garment stuck to his flesh, the poison entered his pores, and the hero, who had borne the world on his shoulders, and to whom nothing was impossible, cried for death in his agony—

"ego sum indefessus agendo,  
Sed nova pestis adest, cui nec virtute resisti  
Nec telis, armave potest."

Wherever the Republic has gone thus far, wherever her name is known, it is an example of the equality of manhood and the freedom of man. This has made her the great benefactor in the Western Hemisphere. But if you have your way, she is to appear in the East to set an example of caste. Do you think with her great problem unsolved, with ten millions of her own people, now thirty-six years after the emancipation proclamation, still waiting for the promise of their perfect freedom to be fulfilled, you are asked to subject ten millions more, of an alien race, to a government in which they have no share, and an authority in which they have no voice. The people which were seventy millions are to be eighty millions—eighty millions, and every fourth man a serf—eighty millions, every fourth man practically an inferior—at the end of the nineteenth century, twenty millions (near seven times the number with which the nation began) practically without the rights of citizenship.

I think the American people will conclude in the end that we shall get no trade advantage either in the Philippine Islands or in China by the forcible subjugation of this people. On the contrary, we injure our trade prospects when we alienate the affection of those people by an unjust attack upon their independence. But there is no space to argue this point now.

Dr. Franklin said:

To me it seems that neither the obtaining or retaining any trade, how valuable soever, is an object for which men may justly spill each other's blood. That the true and sure means of extending and securing commerce are the goodness and cheapness of commodities, and that the profits of no trade can ever be equal to the expense of compelling it and holding it by fleets and armies.

The Doctor, I suppose, was a traitor and a little American.

But we are told if we oppose the policy of our imperialistic and expanding friends we are bound to suggest some policy of our own as a substitute for theirs. We are asked what we would do in this difficult emergency. It is a question not difficult to answer. I for one am ready to answer it.

1. I would declare now that we will not take these islands to govern them against their will.

2. I would reject a cession of sovereignty which implies that sovereignty may be bought and sold and delivered without the consent of the people. Spain had no rightful sovereignty over the Philippine Islands. She could not rightfully sell it to us. We could not rightfully buy it from her.

3. I would require all foreign governments to keep out of these islands.

4. I would offer to the people of the Philippines our help in maintaining order until they have a reasonable opportunity to establish a government of their own.

5. I would aid them by advice, if they desire it, to set up a free and independent government.

6. I would invite all the great powers of Europe to unite in an agreement that that independence shall not be interfered with by us, by themselves, or by any one of them with the consent of the others. As to this I am not so sure. I should like quite as well to tell them it is not to be done whether they consent or not.

7. I would declare that the United States will enforce the same doctrine as applicable to the Philippines that we declared as to Mexico and Haiti and the South American Republics. It is true that the Monroe Doctrine, a doctrine based largely on our regard for our own interests, is not applicable either in terms or in principle to a distant Asiatic territory. But undoubtedly, having driven out Spain, we are bound, and have the right, to secure to the people we have liberated an opportunity, undisturbed and in peace, to establish a new government for themselves.

8. I would then, in a not distant future, leave them to work out their own salvation, as every nation on earth, from the beginning of time, has wrought out its own salvation. Let them work out their own salvation, as our own ancestors slowly and in long centuries wrought out theirs; as Germany, as Switzerland, as France, in briefer periods, wrought out theirs; as Mexico and the South American Republics have accomplished theirs, all of them within a century, some of them within the life of a generation. To attempt to confer the gift of freedom from without, or to impose freedom from without on any people, is to disregard all the lessons of history. It is to attempt

"A gift of that which is not to be given  
By all the blended powers of earth and heaven."

9. I would strike out of your legislation the oath of allegiance to us and substitute an oath of allegiance to their own country.

Mr. President, if you once get involved and entangled in this policy of dominion and empire, you have not only to get the assent of three powers—House, Senate, and President—to escape from it, but to the particular plan and scheme and method of such escape.

My friends say they are willing to trust the people and the future. And so am I. I am willing to trust the people as our fathers trusted them. I am willing to trust the people as they

have, so far, trusted themselves; a people regulated, governed, constrained by the moral law, by the Constitution and by the Declaration. It is the constitutional, not the unconstitutional, will of the American people in which I trust. It is Philip sober and not Philip drunk to whom I am willing to commit the destiny of myself and my children. A people without a constitution is, as I just said, like a man without a conscience. It is the least trustworthy and the most dangerous force on the face of the earth. The utterances of these gentlemen, who, when they are reminded of moral and constitutional restraints, answer us that we are timid, and that they trust the people, are talking in the spirit of the French, not of the American revolution; they are talking in the spirit which destroys republics, and not in the spirit that builds them; they are talking in the spirit of the later days of Rome, of the later days of Athens, and not in the spirit of the early days of any republic that ever existed on this side of the ocean or on the other.

I love and trust the American people. I yield to no man in my confidence in the future of the Republic. To me the dearest blessings of life, dearer than property, dearer than home, dearer than kindred, are my pride in my country and my hope for the future of America. But the people that I trust is the people that established the Constitution and which abides by its restraints. The people that I trust is the people that made the great Declaration, and their children, who mean forever to abide by its principles. The country in whose future I have supreme and unbounded confidence is the Republic, not a despotism on the one hand, or an unchecked and unlicensed democracy on the other. It is no mere democracy. It is the indissoluble union of indestructible States. I disavow and spurn the doctrine that has been more than once uttered by the advocates of this policy of imperialism on the floor of the Senate, that the sovereignty of the American people is inferior to any other because it is restrained and confined within constitutional boundaries. If that be true, the limited monarchy of England is inferior to the despotism of Russia; if that be true, a constitutional republic is inferior to an unconstitutional usurpation; if that be true, a man restrained by the moral law, and obeying the dictates of a conscience, is inferior to the reckless, hardened, unrestrained criminal.

Two years ago we would have been big enough, and strong enough, and brave enough to utter our opinion about the Boer war. Are we enough of a world power to dare to do it to-day? This Philippine Island possession of ours is nothing but a strait-jacket.

When President Cleveland sent in his message about Venezuela, where England made a claim which has been almost wholly supported after arbitration, our friends of the Committee on Foreign Relations almost tumbled over one another in their zeal to get into the Senate Chamber to express their sympathy for Venezuela. They couldn't let a resolution go over from one morning hour to another. Where are they now? They are bound over to keep the peace; and they are bound over to hold their peace—the open door and the shut mouth.

The watchman's clarion voice is still;  
The warder silent on the hill.

Ah, Mr. President, if this is being a world power, for my part I would rather be a world weakness. It is asked what other

nations will think of us if we withdraw from a place where we have no right to be. Does not that question savor somewhat of little Americanism? I never have observed that the great nations of the world were much in the habit of putting that question. Does England ever stop to think or to ask what other nations think of her? Did Rome ever do it? Did Greece ever do it? Great nations do not brag; they are not vain; they are not thinking of the impression they make on the small ones. When we get to be the greatest nation on earth we shall stop talking about it and bragging about it.

We hear a great deal nowadays of "Little America," of "Little Americans." Little America! Why, Mr. President, as my late colleague said, if we can not say of the United States, as Webster or his predecessor said of England, that her "morning drumbeat following the sun, keeping company with the hours, circles the earth in an unbroken strain of the martial airs of England," we can at least say that before the sun sets upon Alaska he has risen upon Maine.

"Little Americans!" Little George Washington! Little Thomas Jefferson! Little Benjamin Franklin! Little Abraham Lincoln! Little Daniel Webster!

Well, I know our friends have the names of great Americans they are willing to contrast with these. I will not presume to enter into particulars. They are all around us. The bushes are full of them.

I do not think we are much of a world power when a brave and manly Senator can say, as one said in my hearing not long ago, that he sympathized with the Boers, but would not say so publicly because of our obligation to Great Britain, who had kept the Continent from meddling with us in the late war. If two years ago such a motive for silence had been imputed to that Senator, how the indignant answer would have flashed out, "Is thy servant a dog?"

Mr. President, there lies at the bottom of what is called imperialism a doctrine which, if adopted, is to revolutionize the world in favor of despotism. It directly conflicts with and contradicts the doctrine on which our own revolution was founded, and with which, so far, our example has revolutionized the world. It is the doctrine that when, in the judgment of any one nation or any combination of nations, the institutions which a people set up and maintain for themselves are disapproved they have a right to overthrow that government and to enter upon and possess it themselves. That is the doctrine upon which intelligent Englishmen put the right of England to make war upon the Boers. They say:

You tax, you impose unreasonable restrictions upon citizenship and upon naturalization. You tax a certain class unjustly, and therefore England purposes to interfere. You do not let Englishmen partake of your franchises on fair and reasonable terms.

Why, Mr. President, when an Englishman offers himself for naturalization elsewhere he renounces his allegiance to the Queen, and if he be an honest man he is to use any newly acquired franchises in the interest of his adopted country and without a thought of the interest of Great Britain. It becomes, therefore, none of England's business on what terms other countries choose to admit him. If she have any interest in the matter it is to prevent his being naturalized at all and to keep him from throwing off his old allegiance. The doctrine so founded is, in substance,

the doctrine of the Holy Alliance—a doctrine in which England herself, under the lead of Canning, repudiated after the overthrow of Napoleon.

Now, Mr. President, somebody must be the judge whether a people make a proper use of their own territory or their own property or no, and from the necessity of the case, under the rule of this moralist, the strong nation that desires the territory and property of the weak nation must of course judge of its own rights and duties in the premises. I think that when England and Russia and Germany and the United States get fairly embarked in the crusade for the application of that principle you will find it complicated by another one, which I have heard of already in relation to the Philippine Islands. If we do not take possession some other strong power will think they are not making good use of their own territory and property, and they will take possession. You will, I think, always find that David will conclude that Naboth is not cultivating his vineyard to the best advantage. You will always find that anybody who wants the widow's ewe lamb will conclude that the widow's notions of raising it or of cooking it are not the best.

Our imperialistic friends seem to have forgotten the use of the vocabulary of liberty. They talk about giving good government. "We shall give them such a government as we think they are fitted for." "We shall give them a better government than they had before." Why, Mr. President, that one phrase conveys to a free man and a free people the most stinging of insults. In that little phrase, as in a seed, is contained the germ of all despotism and of all tyranny. Government is not a gift. Free government is not to be given by all the blended powers of earth and heaven. It is a birthright. It belongs, as our fathers said and as their children said, as Jefferson said and as President McKinley said, to human nature itself. There can be no good government but self-government.

Spain, when she was overrun by Napoleon, was at a far lower point than the people of the Philippine Islands have ever reached. They are much more fit for self-government to-day than she ever was. And yet the great English poet—greatest since Milton—speaks of the offer of Napoleon to give them good government as the last affront, more stinging and insulting than any blow ever struck by his armies, intolerable beyond devastation or death.

We can endure that he should waste our lands,  
Despoil our temples, and by sword and flame  
Return us to the dust from which we came,  
Such food a tyrant's appetite demands;  
And we can brook the thought that by his hands  
Spain may be overpowered, and he possess,  
For his delight, a solemn wilderness  
Where all the brave lie dead. But when of bands  
Which he will break for us he dares to speak,  
Of benefits, and of a future day,  
When our enlightened minds shall bless his sway,  
Then the strained heart of fortitude proves weak,  
Our groans, our blushes, our pale cheeks declare  
That he has power to inflict what we lack strength to bear.

Already the old language of freedom, independence, self-control, self-government is passing away. You hear in many high quarters expressions of gratitude to England; that it is by her favor that we have been able to accomplish our policies without interference from foreign powers. I have the most friendly and kindly

feelings for the people of Great Britain. It is a noble stock. It is made up of noble strands. The sturdy Saxon, the hardy, adventurous Scotsman, the brave and generous Irishman make up a people never surpassed in the quality that makes true greatness by any nation in the Eastern Hemisphere. I shall be glad in every proper way to help to draw the bonds of friendship and of kinship which happily now exist in such strength. But I confess I am humiliated when an American talks of gratitude to any other country for affording the United States its countenance or protection in the pursuit of any course this country may deem it her duty pursue. I am not willing to be dependent on the power of England, either for defense or for protection. Certainly I desire no entangling alliances with her. Still less am I willing to have my countrymen accept the Chinese estimate—"American No. 2 Englishman."

I have failed to discover in the speech, public or private, of the advocates of this war, or in the press which supports it and them, a single expression anywhere of a desire to do justice to the people of the Philippine Islands, or of a desire to make known to the people of the United States the truth of the case. Some of them, like the Senator from Indiana and the President of the Senate, are outspoken in their purpose to retain the Philippine Islands forever, to govern them themselves, or to do what they call giving them such share in government as we hereafter may see fit, having regard to our own interest, and, as they sometimes add, to theirs. The others say, "Hush! We will not disclose our purpose just now. Perhaps we may," as they phrase it, "give them liberty some time. But it is to be a long time first."

The catchwords, the cries, the pithy and pregnant phrases of which all their speech is full, all mean dominion. They mean perpetual dominion. When a man tells you that the American flag must not be hauled down where it has once floated, or demands of a shouting audience, "Who will haul it down?" if he means anything, he means that that people shall be under our dominion forever. The man who says, "We will not treat with them till they submit; we will not deal with men in arms against the flag," says, in substance, the same thing. One thing there has been, at least, given to them as Americans not to say. There is not one of these gentlemen who will rise in his place and affirm that if he were a Filipino he would not do exactly as the Filipinos are doing; that he would not despise them if they were to do otherwise. So much, at least, they owe of respect to the dead and buried history—the dead and buried history, so far as they can slay and bury it—of their country.

Why, the tariff schemes which are proposed are schemes in our interest and not in theirs. If you propose to bring tobacco from Porto Rico or from the Philippine Islands on the ground that it is for the interest of the people whom you are undertaking to govern, for their best interests to raise it and sell it to you, every imperialist in Connecticut will be up in arms. The nerve in the pocket is still sensitive, though the nerve in the heart may be numb. You will not let their sugar come here to compete with the cane sugar of Louisiana or the beet sugar of California or the Northwest, and in determining that question you mean to think not of their interest but of yours. The good government you are to give them is a government under which their great productive and industrial interests, when peace comes, are to be

totally and absolutely disregarded by their government. You are not only proposing to do that, but you expect to put another strain on the Constitution to accomplish it.

Why, Mr. President, the atmosphere of both legislative chambers, even now, is filled with measures proposing to govern and tax these people for our interest, and not for theirs. Your men who are not alarmed at the danger to constitutional liberty are up in arms when there is danger to tobacco. As an eloquent Republican colleague said elsewhere, "Beware that you do not create another Ireland under the American flag." Beware that you do not create many other Irelands—another Ireland in Porto Rico; another Ireland in Cuba; many other Irelands in the Philippines! The great complaint of Ireland for eight centuries was that England framed her taxation and regulated her tariff, not for Ireland's interest, but for her own. That when she dealt with the great industries of that beautiful isle she was thinking of the English exchequer and of the English manufacturer and of the English land-owner; and she reduced Ireland to beggary. Let us not repeat that process.

Is there any man so bold as to utter in seriousness the assertion that where the American flag has once been raised it shall never be hauled down? I have heard it said that to haul down or to propose to haul down this national emblem where it has once floated is poltroonery. Will any man say it was poltroonery when Paul Jones landed on the northeast coast of England that he took his flag away with him when he departed? Was Scott a poltroon, or was Polk a poltroon? Was Taylor a poltroon? Was the United States a nation of poltroons when they retired from the City of Mexico or from Vera Cruz without leaving the flag behind them? Were we poltroons when we receded from Canada? If we had made the attack on the coast of Spain, at one time contemplated during this very war, were we pledged to hold and govern Spain forever or disgraced in the eyes of mankind if we failed to do it? Has England been engaged in the course of poltroonery all these years when she has retired from many a field of victory? According to this doctrine, she was bound to have held Belgium forever after the battle of Waterloo and Spain forever after Corunna and Talavera. She could not, of course, have retired with honor from Venezuela if the arbitration had not ended in her favor.

Mr. President, this talk that the American flag is never to be removed where it has once floated is the silliest and wildest rhetorical flourish ever uttered in the ears of an excited populace. No baby ever said anything to another baby more foolish.

Now, what are the facts as to the Philippine Islands and the American flag? We have occupied a single city, part of one of four hundred islands, and with a population of 120,000 or thereabouts out of 10,000,000. The Spanish forces were invested and hemmed in by the people of those islands, who had risen to assert their own freedom when we got there. Now, what kind of Americanism, what kind of patriotism, what kind of love of liberty is it to say that we are to turn our guns on that patriot people and wrest from them the freedom that was almost within their grasp and hold these islands for our own purposes in subjection and by right of conquest because the American flag ought not to be hauled down where it has once floated, or, for the baser and viler motive still, that we can make a few dollars a year out of their trade?

Mr. President, this is the doctrine of purest ruffianism and tyranny. There is nothing of the Declaration of Independence in it. There is nothing of the Constitution of the United States in it. There is nothing of the fathers in it. There is nothing of George Washington in it, or of Thomas Jefferson. There is nothing in it of the old Virginia or of the old South Carolina or of the old Massachusetts. If every territory over which the flag of a country has once floated must be held and never shall be yielded again to the nation to which it belonged, every war between great and powerful nations must be a war of extermination or a war of dishonor alike to the victor and to the vanquished.

We expected, did we not, at the time of our declaration of war that we would not wrest Cuba from Spain for any purpose of our own aggrandizement, but only that there might be established there a free government for the people thereof, and that the people of Cuba were, and of right ought to be, a free, independent state; that our flag would float in Cuba while the operation of the war was going on as it has floated in glory and in honor. Was that a pledge to a course which should dishonor and degrade the flag of our country in the face of mankind? Who shall haul it down when the time comes? The man who signed his name to that promise, a man with whose name no thought of dishonor or degradation to his country's flag was ever associated, will keep his own honor and that of the country and that of the flag unstained by hauling it down himself.

I tell my friends who appeal to the flag of the country, and who say that no matter what question of righteousness, or justice, or constitutional power may be up, they stand with the flag, and follow the drum, and listen to nothing but the sound of the trumpet, and care only for the men in uniform, and postpone all questions of liberty or of humanity till the martial music is silent and the clash of arms is over and the flag is furled. I tell these friends of mine that the American flag is a higher and a more sacred thing to me than it is to them. I love the flag, not as a bit of colored bunting, not for its bright colors or its floating folds, but as a holy and as a sacred symbol. The American flag is dear to my heart because it seems something more, and something loftier, and something nobler than is represented by the flag of any other country. I mean, if I can, to keep its pure folds free from stain. In the old days of slavery the great English poet Campbell excited the anger of the American people by a stinging satire:

"United States, your banner wears  
Two emblems—one of fame;  
Alas, the other that it bears  
Reminds us of your shame."  
  
"Your standard's constellation types  
White freedom by its stars;  
But what's the meaning of the stripes?  
They mean your negroes' scars."

What said the liberty-loving leaders of those great generations? Did they say: "If the flag typify slavery, we are for slavery; if the flag stand for oppression, we are oppressors forever more." No. They said: "If the flag shall wave over the great territory between the Mississippi and the Pacific, it shall wave over a free territory."

When the authority of the United States, in the days of Franklin Pierce and James Buchanan, undertook to subjugate the free men of Kansas and Nebraska, they stood for their freedom.

They denied the right of James Buchanan or of Franklin Pierce to make this holy symbol the emblem of the government of man, or any race of men, against its will.

Now, Mr. President, it seems to me that these are grave questions. They are things worth thinking of by American Senators and American statesmen. They go down to the roots of our national life. They are not of yesterday, of to-day, or to-morrow alone. They were thought of when our country was settled. They were debated during the century's long strife that preceded the Revolution. The minds of the Fathers were full of them. Their answer to them was written in the imperishable lines of the Declaration of Independence, and in the constitutions of the States and of the nation. We have been brought up to think of them through the whole of our first century of greatness and of glory. We reaffirmed our doctrine about them again when we celebrated our centennial in 1876. They were daily and nightly on the thoughts of Abraham Lincoln and Charles Sumner. If Lincoln and Sumner should repeat what they thought of them now, they would be denounced as "little Americans," as "squaw men," and blacklisted as traitors.

Now, what is the answer we get when we repeat the old doctrine, not in our own language, but in the language of the Fathers, and of Lincoln, and of Sumner? Why, the answer—there are some creditable exceptions—but in general the answer we get is that there is a soldier in uniform somewhere shooting somebody; that the American flag is flying, and some poor devils, who run when they come in sight of it, half armed, half disciplined, half clad, half fed, have got these ideas into their heads also, and are fighting for them and dying for them, and thinking we are invading them and are firing at our flag. Are you afraid of them? No. Are they formidable? No. Does the condition, according to your theory, of foreign war exist? No. But so long as the flag of the United States, standing for seventy million people—the richest, strongest, brightest, as we claim, on the face of the earth, anywhere the wide world over, is resisted there can be no question of liberty, honor, constitutional liberty, or national obligation considered throughout this broad continent. Why, Mr. President, if this be true, and there is nothing to be talked about but uniforms and flags and drums and trumpets till the last Filipino is dead in the last ditch, Aguinaldo has beaten you already. He has driven you to eat the bravest word you ever spoke. He has driven you to spit on the memory of your Fathers; to trample on your oaths to support the Constitution; to substitute an empty drum for your brains, and a fife for your conscience; and to do your thinking from this time forward, not with your head, but with your heels.

Certainly the flag should never be lowered from any moral field over which it has once waved. To follow the flag is to follow the principles of freedom and humanity for which it stands. To claim that we must follow it when it stands for injustice or oppression is like claiming that we must take the nostrums of the quack doctor who stamps it on his wares, or follow every scheme of wickedness or fraud, if only the flag be put at the head of the prospectus. The American flag is in more danger from the imperialists than there would be if the whole of Christendom were to combine its power against it. Foreign violence at worst could only rend it. But these men are trying to stain it.

It is claimed—what I do not believe—that these appeals have the sympathy of the American people. It is said that the statesman who will lay his ear to the ground will hear their voice. I do not believe it. The voice of the American people does not come from the ground. It comes from the sky. It comes from the free air. It comes from the mountains, where liberty dwells. Let the statesman who is fit to deal with the question of liberty or to utter the voice of a free people lift his ear to the sky—not lay it to the ground.

Mr. President, it was once my good fortune to witness an impressive spectacle in this Chamber, when the Senators answered to their names in rendering solemn judgment in a great State trial. By a special provision each Senator was permitted, when he cast his vote, to state his reason in a single sentence. I have sometimes fancied that the question before us now might be decided not alone by the votes of us who sit here to-day, but of the great men who have been our predecessors in this Chamber and in the Continental Congress from the beginning of the Republic.

Would that that roll might be called. The solemn assembly sits silent while the Chair puts the question whose answer is so fraught with the hopes of liberty and the destiny of the Republic.

The roll is called. George Washington: "No. Why should we quit our own, to stand on foreign ground?"

Alexander Hamilton: "No. The Declaration of Independence is the fundamental constitution of every State."

Thomas Jefferson: "No. Governments are instituted among men deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. Every people ought to have that separate and equal station among the nations of the world to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them."

John Adams: "No. I stood by the side of Jefferson when he brought in the Declaration; I was its champion on the floor of Congress. After our long estrangement, I come back to his side again."

James Madison: "No. The object of the Federal Constitution is to secure the union of the thirteen primitive States, which we know to be practicable, and to add to them such other States as may arise in their own bosoms or in their neighborhood, which we can not doubt will be practicable."

Thomas Corwin: "No. I said in the days of the Mexican war: 'If I were a Mexican, as I am an American, I would welcome you with bloody hands to hospitable graves'; and Ohio to-day honors and loves me for that utterance beyond all her other sons."

Daniel Webster: "No. Under our Constitution there can be no dependencies. Wherever there is in the Christian and civilized world a nationality of character, then a national government is the necessary and proper result. There is not a civilized and intelligent man on earth that enjoys satisfaction with his condition if he does not live under the government of his own nation, his own country. A nation can not be happy but under a government of its own choice. When I depart from these sentiments I depart from myself."

William H. Seward: "No. The framers of the Constitution never contemplated colonies or provinces at all. They contemplated States only; nothing less than States—perfect States, equal States, sovereign States. There is reason, there is sound political

wisdom, in this provision of the Constitution—excluding colonies, which are always subject to oppression, and excluding provinces, which always tend to corrupt and enfeeble and ultimately to break down the parent State."

John Marshall: "No. The power to declare war was not conferred upon Congress for the purpose of aggression or aggrandizement. A war declared by Congress can never be presumed to be waged for the purpose of conquest or the acquisition of territory, nor does the law declaring the war imply an authority to the President to enlarge the limits of the United States by subjugating the enemy's country."

John Quincy Adams: "No. The territories I helped bring into the nation were to be dwelt in by free men and made into free States."

Aaron Burr: "Yes. You are repeating my buccaneering expedition down the Mississippi. I am to be vindicated at last!"

Abraham Lincoln: "No. I said in Independence Hall at Philadelphia, just before I entered upon my great office, that I rested upon the truth Thomas Jefferson has just uttered, and that I was ready to be assassinated, if need be, in order to maintain it. And I was assassinated in order to maintain it."

Charles Sumner: "No. I proclaimed it when I brought in Alaska. I sealed my devotion with my blood, also. It was my support and solace through those many long and weary hours when the red-hot iron pressed upon my spine, the very source and origin of agony, and I did not flinch. He knows our country little, little also of that great liberty of ours, who supposes that we could receive such a transfer. On each side there is impossibility. Territory may be conveyed, but not a people."

William McKinley—William McKinley: "There has been a cloud before my vision for a moment, but I see clearly now; I go back to what I said two years ago: 'Forcible annexation is criminal aggression; governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, not of some of them, but of all of them.' I will stand with the Fathers of the Republic. I will stand with the founders of the Republican party. No."

Mr. President, I know how imperfectly I have stated this argument. I know how feeble is a single voice amid this din and tempest, this delirium of empire. It may be that the battle for this day is lost. But I have an assured faith in the future. I have an assured faith in justice and the love of liberty of the American people. The stars in their courses fight for freedom. The Ruler of the heavens is on that side. If the battle to-day go against it, I appeal to another day, not distant and sure to come. I appeal from the clapping of hands and the stamping of feet and the brawling and the shouting to the quiet chamber where the Fathers gathered in Philadelphia. I appeal from the spirit of trade to the spirit of liberty. I appeal from the Empire to the Republic. I appeal from the millionaire, and the boss, and the wire-puller, and the manager to the statesman of the elder time, in whose eyes a guinea never glistened, who lived and died poor, and who left to his children and to his countrymen a good name far better than riches. I appeal from the Present, bloated with material prosperity, drunk with the lust of empire, to another and a better age. I appeal from the Present to the Future and to the Past. [Applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Visitors in the galleries will

please remember that under the rules of the Senate no expressions of approval or disapproval are permitted, and if there is a repetition of the applause the Sergeant-at-Arms will be required to clear the galleries at once.

#### APPENDIX.

The Government of the Filipinos has considered it its duty to expound before the civilized nations the happenings which caused a rupture of its formerly friendly relations with the army of the United States in these islands in order that they should come to be convinced that on my side everything has been done to avoid said rupture, even at the cost of many rights which were thus sacrificed without use.

After the naval battle, which had taken place on the 1st of May, between the American and the Spanish squadron the commanding officer of the latter consented to my return from Hongkong to this beloved soil, and distributed even amongst the Filipinos a number of rifles found in the arsenal at Cavite, without doubt for the purpose that I should again start the revolution, which, owing to the treaty of Biak-na-Bato, had become extinct to some extent, and in order to secure thus the help of the Filipinos.

At the outbreak of the hostilities between America and Spain the inhabitants had fully comprehended that now the moment had come to take up again the arms in behalf of their struggle for liberty, they being sure that the latter nation would be vanquished and would never again be in a position to lead them on to the way of prosperity and progress; they, therefore, rejoiced at my arrival, and I had the honor to be chosen their chief, owing to the services which I had been able to render in the previous revolution. Thereupon all Filipinos, without distinction of rank and classes, took up arms, and each province hastened to drive the Spanish troops from within its boundaries. Thus it is explained how it is possible that, after so short a time, my Government dominates to-day over the whole of Luzon, in the Visayan Islands, and in a part of Mindanao.

Although the Americans have not had any share whatever in the military operations that have cost so much blood and money, my Government is ready to acknowledge that the destruction of the Spanish squadron and the turning over to us of a number of rifles from the arsenal has had a certain influence on the progress of our army. Besides that, it seemed a matter of certainty that the American troops would needs have to sympathize with a revolution which they fomented, and which has saved them so much blood and fatigues, and, above all, I had such unbounded confidence in the history and the traditions of a nation which had fought for independence and against slavery, and which appeared as the champion of liberty of the oppressed and downtrodden nations.

Seeing the Filipinos thus friendly disposed toward them, the Americans disembarked their forces at Parahaque and took positions along the whole line occupied by my troops as far as Maytubig, taking hold by means of astuteness not free from force of a great many trenches constructed by my sappers; they caused the garrison of Manila to surrender, which, owing to its being hedged in by my forces, had to surrender after the first attack, in which I took a most active part, although I had not been notified of its date, my troops advancing as far as Malate, Ermita, Pako, Sampalok, and Tondo, all parts of Manila.

Notwithstanding these services, and although the Spaniards would surely not have surrendered had not my troops cut off all possibility of a retreat to the interior, the American generals not only did not even mention me when stipulating the details of the capitulation, but they moreover demanded the withdrawal of my troops from the port of Cavite, and from the suburbs of Manila.

I submitted to the American generals that I had not been treated justly, and I asked them in courteous terms that they should acknowledge at least to some extent my cooperation, but they were deaf to my entreaties.

Being all the same desirous of showing friendship and good feeling toward those who pronounced themselves the liberators of the Philippine nation, I withdrew my troops from the port of Cavite, and from the suburbs of Ermita, Malate, Sampalok, and Tondo, only retaining a part of the suburb of Pako.

In spite of these concessions, it lasted but a few days before Admiral Dewey, without any given motive, took away our launches, which with special consent of his had been stationed in the Bay of Manila. Almost at the same time I received a letter from General Otis, commander in chief of the American army of occupation, demanding that I should withdraw my troops from the territory which he had pointed out in a plan accompanying said letter, the territory including even the township of Pandakan and the quarter of Singalang, which had never belonged to the city limits.

In view of this unqualifiable proceeding of the two American chiefs I held a war council, and consulted also the opinion of my privy council, and in agreement with the opinion given by them I nominated commissioners, who were to come to an understanding with the above.

Although the reception accorded by Admiral Dewey to my commissioners was anything but pleasant, he not even allowing them to speak to him, I nevertheless conceded to the friendly entreaties of General Otis, withdrawing my army to the territory pointed out by him, in order to avoid all contract with his troops—a matter that had come to cause a good deal of trouble; when doing this I confidently hoped that, the conference at Paris having come to an end, my people would obtain the freedom promised to them by Mr. Pratt, the consul-general at Singapore, and that then the friendship which so often had been expressed in the manifestations and speeches of the American generals who had come to these parts would be definitely insured.

Matters, however, did not turn out that way: The generals referred to considered the delegates which I had sent to them in the behalf of peace as a proof of my weakness; and thus it happened that, their ambitious designs increasing, they sent a force to Iloilo on the 26th of December last in order to seize as conquerors that part of the Philippines which also belonged to my government.

Such a proceeding which is so far removed from the line of action followed by the civilized nations, entitles me to proceed without any further consideration. But nevertheless, in order to be correct in my actions up to the end, I sent commissioners to General Otis, asking him to desist from so temerarious an undertaking. The same were, however, not listened to.

My government can not remain indifferent in view of a violent and aggressive usurpation of a part of its territory by a nation which has styled itself the champion of the oppressed people; and it is, therefore, ready to start hostilities, should the Americans try to carry out the occupation of the Bisayan Islands.

I denounce these actions before the whole world, in order that the public conscience should, by its inflexible judgment, clearly designate those who really are the oppressors and the hangmen of humanity.

On their heads may fall all the blood which will be spilled.

EMILIO AGUINALDO.

MALOLOS, January 5, 1899.

"Revolucion" of the 19th of January, 1900.



